

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XII

APRIL, 1927

No. 2

EDITORIAL

NOT ONLY GEOGRAPHIC DISTANCE BUT ALSO HISTORIC time seems to be shortened by modern enterprise. The radio has abolished distance, so that one can sit by his fire on a winter night and hear a speech or a concert a thousand miles away, and can command many of the entertainment facilities of a score of cities.

Less spectacular are the results of archeology, but not less important for the advancement of human knowledge. Voices of the distant past are heard today. Each new discovery means that by just so much more must speculation yield to fact.

Previous articles by Bishop Du Bose in this quarterly have attracted favorable attention. The one published this time, Shechem and Primeval Monotheism, will certainly lose nothing by comparison, especially as the writer has himself visited the site of Shechem during the work of excavation there.

As is shown, this important ancient city has been definitely located only since the time the Great War began, yet the work there has been most profitable, even thus far, as appears in the present account.

The Biblical history of Shechem, the recent discoveries there, their bearing upon certain views of Old Testament critics and upon theories as to the origin of

monotheism, all combine to make up an illuminating paper covering matters with which Old Testament criticism must reckon.

Hardly can the antediluvian and early postdiluvian ages any longer be looked upon as a "land separated from us by an impassable gulf." Neither can criticism any longer maintain with assurance, that monotheism has "arisen as an evolution out of polytheism," but polytheism is now seen to be "a corruption of monotheism."

Again is the spade confirming the Old Testament records and recovering pages of history supposed to have been irretrievably lost.

THE MORE ITEMS IN A CREED, THE GREATER WILL BE THE liability of confusion, of dispute, and of obscuring its essentials. Again, even with a few articles of belief, mischief may be done by placing the emphasis on the less important. One believes in the inspiration of the Bible. Very good; but he must not stop there, for the great thing about the Scriptures is their spiritual message, rather than the exact way in which it was conveyed.

There is that in man's soul which responds to the very presence of divine truth, even as the needle is moved by the magnet brought near it. The great argument for the inspiration of Scripture is found, not in this or that theory about it, but in the intuitive recognition of the divine certainty of the message itself.

In Dr. Chown's article, *The Authority of Biblical Truth*, the chief place is given to "spiritual perception" in "the study of essential truth." After distinguishing between the historical and spiritual truths of the Scriptures Dr. Chown touches upon the differences in the

views of inspiration held since the Reformation, and especially the change during the past fifty years.

He points out that the Reformers "were not so much concerned about the literary infallibility of the Bible as they were anxious to bring religion back to inward faith in Christ." He also reminds us that the idea of "literary infallibility" has swayed between the extreme and the indifferent view from time to time during the four centuries since Luther's day. The relation of fiction to spiritual truth forms a suggestive section of the paper. A strong claim for the authority of the Bible, and that as residing in its truth as spiritually seen, closes this plea for properly placed emphasis in matters Biblical.

IN THE SCHOLARLY STUDIES COVERING THE PERIOD marking the struggle between Christianity and classic paganism, which Dr. Sihler has been contributing to this quarterly, the chief attention has been directed to pagan beliefs, conditions, and events. In the present number our author turns to a distinctly Biblical subject, and one most interesting to scholars and laymen alike—St. John of Galilee, Bishop at Ephesus.

After some preliminary paragraphs in which his own staunch faith emerges, Dr. Sihler turns to the time of John's birth, his family, and the age and environment in which he lived. Then comes some account of Ephesus and its life in the time of John, and after that the study of the Apostle John's activities and writings, more especially the Gospel bearing his name. The question of John's identity with the "Presbyter John" is touched upon, and after that the purpose of the Fourth Gospel is considered. Its relation to Gnosticism, the Prologue, the supposed Philo influence, the Logos,

John's message, peculiarities of his style, and other details follow.

To his remarks upon John's style our author adds some translations of his own, and shows from the "anti-quarian, topographical, lexical notes in John" that the Apostle "wrote for Gentile Christians who also, from Paul's foundation onward, seem to have constituted the bulk of the *ecclesiae* in John's actual province."

The readers of Dr. Sihler's former essays in these pages will welcome the present one in the Biblical field, and the announcement that he hopes to follow this with a paper upon Seneca and Paul.

PERHAPS IT WOULD BE PROPER TO CLASS MOTIVES AS SELFISH and unselfish. Most people act chiefly from motives of their own safety, comfort, and pleasure. Yet there is a company of glorious souls who put duty first, who seek the will of God before their own desires, and the welfare of others before their own comfort.

Not only is this true, but strong and courageous spirits find a deep satisfaction in careers of sacrifice and hardship. They answer, in spiritual and moral life, to good soldiers who endure the severe strain of some great contest, and, like good soldiers, they carry on with enthusiasm and joy.

The church needs men for whom trials spell opportunity, and one of the places where it needs them is its rural work. From his vantage point of a position giving unusual means of knowing the situation, Mr. McLaughlin considers The Challenge and Compensations of the Country Preacher. He is perfectly frank in outlining the needs in this field and the hardships which the country preacher is called to face. This is the way to call out men of character. In principle it is like

Garibaldi's famous appeal to the Italian patriots. It will not find favor with the timid, the weak, or the comfort loving young man who desires a soft berth in the ministry.

But there are splendid compensations, as is shown, and not the least is the fine development of one's own personality in an environment that calls for courage, independence, self-reliance, and resourcefulness. It is the place for the man who longs to be something in the work of the Kingdom rather than to have something of the ease and delights of the world.

A GOOD WORKMAN SELECTS JUST THE RIGHT TOOL FOR his immediate purpose. Some other might answer, after a fashion, but part of his skill lies in the consistency between the tool and the task. Happy is the preacher—and his congregation—if he has the instinct for the right sermon for the occasion, the right style for his theme, the right illustration. Dr. Goodell, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Evangelism, of the Federal Council of Churches, considers a similar point in his paper, *What Version in the Pulpit?*

The independent translations of the Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, have doubtless contributed to a more accurate understanding of the inspired writings. There has even been a demand for a generally acceptable Bible in the present English vernacular. However, habit is strong, and no recent version has won universal acceptance with the Christian public.

Dr. Goodell makes a vigorous plea for adherence to the King James Version for pulpit use. Admitting the advantages of modern revisions, he shows that mass

psychology and discriminating literary taste nevertheless favor the old version.

Although the demand for the greatest accuracy in rendering the original tongues cannot be set aside, still much weight must be given to the effect of the different versions respectively upon the hearer in the pew. Along this line Dr. Goodell makes his strongest argument for the use of the King James Version in the pulpit.

THE EFFORTS OF MEN TO COME AT THE GENESIS OF things is strikingly illustrated in most of the books reviewed in this number. Religion and religious history are as attractive as ever to minds that seek the when, the how, and the why of the great subjects of human inquiry. The books considered this time are:

A Century of Excavation in Palestine.—Macalister.

Christian Fundamentals.—Baird.

Religion in the Making.—Whitehead.

The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul.—Baillie.

Essays Catholic and Critical.—Members of the Anglican Communion.

R. M. K.

SHECHEM AND PRIMEVAL MONOTHEISM

By BISHOP H. M. DU BOSE

SHECHEM always has held a pleasing interest for Bible students of every degree of attainment. A sufficient explanation of this interest is found in the residence there of the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob, in the near-by antiphonal rehearsal of the Law, and in the final sepulture there of the bones of Joseph. The accounts of these events, which were separated by centuries of time, have maintained an unfailing regnancy over the religious mind; but in more recent years the importance of Shechem as a chief focus of Bible criticism has been made to appear.

The identification and excavation of the ruins of this ancient capital have not only confirmed, but have greatly enhanced, this early interest. The critical evaluation of Shechem must now include the remotest ethnic and cultic traditions of the Semitic peoples, those peoples with which most directly are concerned the early narratives of the Scriptures; while the written history of the most important group of these peoples, the Hebrews, acquires a new meaning as a result of the Shechem excavations.

Monotheism, or the worship of one God, is an early and definite Scripture assumption; and one which is qualified by no collateral observation or allusion. It stands as a fundamental fact of the indefinite cycles of antediluvian history, that men called upon the Name of a God whose personality and unity were recognized and directly addressed. But the connecting record of mono-

theism was obscured, not to say lost, in the millennium-long transitions from that most ancient to a less ancient cultic state of mankind. For the recovery of the clue to this record the world of faith and scholarship is waiting. It is by no means a risk to assert that the historical truth of the Scriptures is of such value to mankind that adequate proof of its every essential point and feature has been divinely provided for and committed to a sure keeping against such time as its discovery will most avail. Enough is already known to warrant the expectation that testimony to the existence of primeval monotheism is forthcoming. Archeology well has demonstrated its usefulness as a means to the end of witnessing to the truth of Scripture record. The testimony to a primeval monotheism is due to come from the results of archeological research. It is my belief that the discoveries at Shechem are demonstrably in the line of this testimony.

It is provocative of surprise that a larger appraisal of Shechem should not have been made during the many past years of critical restraint and research. The situation, when reviewed, appears truly mysterious. But the delay may be a conservation and not a loss. The ancient Amorite seat comes again into the light; and its testimony is to be written in the digests of a new constructive Bible science. But I fully recognize the necessity of admitting that this testimony must be progressive. The conclusiveness of it will not be grasped at once. Moreover, the advance in appropriating its largess will not be chiefly forward, from the details of its "finds" and retrievements, to important critical uses; but rather backward, from that large ethnic and cultic concept, of which already I have

spoken, to an identification and alignment of the output of excavation.

It is in the direction of these observations that the present dissertation on Shechem has been undertaken. A catalogue of the potsherds, bronzes, tablets, cultic relics, and architectural remains recovered, while providing an infallible guide in fixing dates and indicating temporal relationships, points further to an ethnic calendarial world record, the objective of the present inquiry. Therefore, waiving a discussion of historical details, it will be relevant here to say that the uncovering of the ruins of Shechem has brought to view the remains of a city whose past easily runs to the end of the third millennium B.C. These ruins represent a Semitic civilization stretching from the time of the earliest settlement of the land of Canaan (approximately 2300 B.C.) to the end of the Israelitish era. The trend of this Shechem history, read upward through the several archeological strata, Amoritic and Israelitish, to the ninth century B.C., logically corroborates several of the otherwise insufficiently attested facts of the ancient Israelitish era. Indeed, a new line of advance is indicated in the results of the discovery of Shechem.

Nor is the word "discovery," in this connection, used as an imagery. The discovery was geographically literal. From the time of the conquest of Vespasian in Syria to a decade or two before the World War the site of Shechem was believed to be covered by the more modern city of Nablus, and thus beyond the reach of the ordinary means of archeological retrieval. This has been disproved completely. The distinction of having corrected this two thousand year old error belongs to Dr. Ernst Sellin, of the University of Berlin, the primate of living archeologists. While prosecuting ex-

cavations at Jericho and Ta'anach, he identified the *tel* of Balata-Sichem, one and one-half miles eastward from Nablus, as the ruins of the Bible Shechem. Test trenches sunk in the mass of these ruins, in 1914 and 1926, confirmed this identification. An array of fine temple and palace foundations, a *stadt mauer*, or defense wall, four to six kilometers in circuit, and the fundaments of a tower and gate of astonishing strength and goodliness of architecture, answered the onset of pick and spade. After months of basket "carting" by a horde of Arab laborers, there was reached, in the lowest stratum, the clean cut plan of what I believe to be the oldest city of Palestine, and the first capital of the Amorite influence in the land of Canaan. Herein, as will be readily seen, lies the tremendous value of these ruins.

But, as already intimated, more significant than the exhibit of well hewn stones, skilfully laid, is the backward look which they afford of an older civilization, equal if not superior to this one, in the motherland, or earlier habitat, of these Shechemite builders. The buildings are unequalled by any hitherto identified with the early Palestinian age; they are the finger-boards pointing back to a challenging antiquity. The thought awakes a startling interest and suggests the vastness and intricacy of the problem yet to be dealt with by ethnic and cultic science. There is, indeed, present in these ruins, and suggested in their relationships, a something which seems to lay hold upon a monotheistic consciousness reaching back to the archons so confidently and distinctly affirmed of by the Scriptures, as being in possession of the knowledge of the one true God.

It is not here a question of the degree of that knowl-

edge, but only of the fact, which is the norm and the measure of the Scriptural claim. It must be allowed that the monotheistic God idea of the antediluvian tradition was a simple, non-theological concept, almost cosmic at its base, a concomitant of natural intelligence and emotion, enlarging or changing with the play of these, but susceptible to revelatory influences and both ethical and spiritual. Nor can those who take the Bible record to be of any worth fail to note that, as representing the antediluvian period, and for a long while during postdiluvian times, no slightest account is entered concerning polytheism or idolatry. In the nature of the case fetichism arose in a time when the heart of man was evil and that continually; but the only note encountered is that of the worship of one God, or else of the gross and carnal neglect of the same for the indulgence of lust and appetite. The devout were ever a minority.

To the writer, to whom it fell to have a sympathetic part in the task of the Shechem uncovering, the privilege came as a token of divine favor. The result of the work is destined to be not only effectively specific, but cumulative. After the heat and strife of near a century of pragmatism and radical assumptions, the story of this pivotol shrine and capital will contribute a new influence to, as well as set a new objective before, the schools of critical interpretation. It not only seems to be the half-way house back to the evidence of an early postdiluvian monotheism, but it is a new, strong, and enduring link in the argument for Semitic unity and the integrity of a primeval Semitic tradition, involving the truth and clarity of the Genesis stories and the historical basis of the patriarchal *toledoths* or genealogies. It is thus the answer to a crucial present need in Bible

proof, as it is the pledge of a more reverent and careful approach to the central problems of Bible history and tradition.

Reverence is, indeed, an element of Bible science sadly wanting today. The settled assumption of non-historicity which the schools for the past fifty years have brought to the task of Bible interpretation, has deadened the religious consciousness of the world, and become an Old Man of the Sea to its intellectual ideals. The relation between revelation and literature is closer than the world at large dreams or can understand. With the loss of faith in the letter of revelation the spirit went out of literature. This has been the plight of letters for a half-century. An event of quickening was needed. Concatenated fact, and not deductive philosophy, is the better means for analyzing the records of both religion and history. Archeology, and not grammar, will have the last word in criticism. Philology cannot be made a substitute for living fact and experience; and the further back the record of human experience extends, the more difficult becomes the task of subjecting it to a philosophical deduction. A tablet or a potsherd from an ancient Semitic city is worth tomes of hypothetical speculations concerning "sources" and "redactors." This is the large value of uncovered Shechem.

At first, the promoters of the uncovering thought of their task as culminating in a proof of the historicity of Jacob. That proof, which inheres in the letter of the city's recovered materials, soon became an incident, meritorious, indeed, but of secondary value in the face of the backward swing of a relationship that suggests a new assessment of ethnic consciousness and faith. In this focus Shechem now stands as a supreme integer.

A skeptical and unfriendly criticism will be disposed to attack its testimony; but that testimony must prove of perennial significance, as it will demand anew to be inquired into and anew be made manifest.

Bible archeology has reached the point where it no longer should be content to exhibit lists of clay "henkles," unglazed pottery, cultic *bric a brac*, and the like, and to leave the issue rest at that. Important and conclusive as these are, they are but the minor premise of a syllogism whose conclusion, like the rings of Saturn, encompasses the world of life and destiny. To draw a line of cultic darkness across the face of the world at about the tenth century B.C., as the critics have done, is, in view of the earlier records of Genesis, to admit, not so much the unreliability of Genesis, as the impotency of Bible science, so called, to deal with its own data and discoveries. The light from Shechem at this juncture is timely, in that it illuminates the way to a conclusion consistent with the Genesis record.

Perhaps the most clarifying view of the history of Shechem is to be had by taking that history in retrospect; and then returning in necessary detail over its successive periods. With the dawn of the ninth century B.C. Shechem ceased to be of importance and all but passed out of existence so far as the general life of Israel was concerned. The removal of Jeroboam I from Shechem, and the successive occupation of Tirzah, Jezreel, and Samaria as their capitals by later kings of the northern Kingdom of Israel brought the last of many culminations in the political fortunes of the ancient Amorite city. After having been the meeting place of Israel when the crown of Rehoboam was in the balance, and when the ten tribes revolted to Jeroboam the son of Nebat, Shechem seemed to be indicated as the

administrative center of the seceding state. There Jeroboam built a palace and established a court, about which streamed, for a time, the formative forces of the new order, and where centered the neo-Balaamism which finally occasioned the downfall of the Northern Kingdom.

The reasons of Jeroboam and his successors for deserting Shechem are not, even now, apparent nor seem in any ascertainable measure to be valid. There is no other place in Palestine to be compared in natural defense with Shechem; and its geographical situation, even in the diminished territory of the ten tribes, was ideal. The fortified hill of Samaria, only two leagues distant, though it prolonged the national life of Israel for a hundred and fifty years, still lacked many of the fine natural advantages of the Ebal-Gerezim pass. Did Providence enter into the equations of history through the short-sightedness of men? Had the corporate life of the Northern Kingdom remained within the Ebal-Gerezim hand clasp, not even the hosts of Shalmanezzer might have been able to compel its submission. Because of its sins and degrading idolatries Northern Israel had to be eliminated from the divine plan. Its vulnerability would, therefore, have seemed to be Providentially ordered. The desertion of Shechem by its kings left its ancient ruins and secrets to be lost—and then to be found in a time when those secrets should become as oracles of the truth.

The abortive effort of Abimelech to establish a kingdom at Shechem in the time of the Judges held the stage about two centuries after Joshua had made it the capital of the Israelitish confederacy, and after he had there re-enacted the codes of Sinai, set up an inscribed memorial stone, appointed a sanctuary, and designated

the place as a city of refuge. The effect of Abimelech's *coup d'état* was transitory, but the incident serves to show the then existing estimate of the strategic and political importance of Shechem for the control of the land. Something like this estimate was held by both Abraham and Jacob. Jacob put his estimate of the strategic value of Shechem to a certain test. That he did not realize on his estimate was no fault of his. This does not belong to our present discussion. However it is well to say in this connection that Jacob's journey plan from Padanaram was changed at the ford of the Jabbok, and that his settlement at Shechem, rather than at Hebron, was with a view to entering upon the immediate and actual possession of the land through generation. For the successful carrying out of that design the possession of Shechem was indispensable. To people and hold it was to control the land. This was not to be a conquest of war, but of multiples. The deflowering of Dinah and the inquisition of Jacob's sons put an end to this design and deferred the conquest four hundred years. These facts become a part of our view of the critical value of the Shechem history.

The antiquity of Shechem is largely bound up in the showing that may be made of the importance of the place during the residence there of Abraham and Jacob. The difficulties in Old Testament chronology are nowhere more persistent than those encountered in the age of Abraham. The chief problem is that of the identity of the Amraphel of Genesis 14 and Hammurabi, the Bablyonian lawgiver. From one to two centuries of reckoning seem to be involved in the calculation, but the preponderance of opinion weighs in favor of identity. The advantage of chronology will go to Abraham, and hence to Jacob and Shechem.

Accepting the conclusion as trustworthy, the migration of Abraham into Palestine must come near the beginning of the second millennium B.C. At that time Shechem already was existent as a city. Our Authorized Version calls it a "place" (Gen. 14:6); but the Hebrew word *maqom* (place) is elsewhere in Genesis used in connection with both Sodom and Hebron (18:24, 33); and, in each case, the word is found in what the critics designate as the E document. In each of these connections, it can mean only city, an organized and functioning municipality. In the time of Abraham both Sodom and Hebron complied with this definition; so also did Shechem. The specimens of pottery retrieved from the deepest fundaments of Shechem support the Scriptures in the early urban date allowed it. This date securely stands at 2000-2300 B.C.; it may be earlier, even 2500. Further uncovering only can tell.

In this connection the argument from necessity is of considerable value. Such a center as we have supposed Shechem to be was a logical outcome of the ethnic situation in Palestine near the middle or the end of the third millennium B.C. As we have seen, the geographical and topographical peculiarities of the situation of Shechem indicate it as the center pre-eminent for such an ethnic concentration. Professor Clay named Aleppo as the focus of the larger northern Amorite affinities. The same argument may be used for Shechem as the point of southern cohesion. By every token its ruins are a grave of empire.

Jacob's stay at Shechem is to be placed about a century and a half later than that of Abraham. This stay probably covered about seven years. That a long settled and well organized city, with outlying dependencies, existed at that time is of the letter of the

Genesis narrative. The pottery specimens of the Canaanitish stratum are corroborative of the early chronology. An inexact, but approximate, date for the residence of Jacob at Shechem, therefore, would fall near the middle or end of the nineteenth century B.C. This is comfortingly near the figures of tradition.¹

Perhaps we here should advert briefly to the objection that Genesis does not favor the claim for a city and a settled political state at Shechem as early as the date ascribed to Abraham. Already I have called attention to the meaning of the word "place," as used in connection with Shechem in the story of Abraham. That should be conclusive, but the reference to the plain of Moreh (Gen. 12:6) is further indication of settled conditions. Moreh is here the name of a man, the owner of the land thus described, as Shemer was the owner of the hill of Samaria, and Mamre of the field or plain at Hebron. Administrative authority and property rights had attained settled conditions long before the patriarchs came into the land. South Palestine cities, as Salem, Sodom, and Hebron, confessedly later settlements than Shechem, were impressively advanced, as we see them, in material matters. In a way Shechem was the mother city of them all.

It now remains to bridge the chasm of time between the age of the patriarchs and that in which the Shechemite builders occupied a habitat in the general Semitic sphere. Without more than indicating the fact that there have been entered many and spirited objections

¹ Dr. Sellin sets the probable date of the "building of the cyclopean western and northern walls and the west wing of the palace of Shechem" at the beginning of the 17th century B.C. This probably is near the true date of Jacob's residence there, though a space still lies between that and the Amraphel chronology. The noteworthy building enterprise there between the 17th and 18th centuries may explain the patriarch's choice of Shechem as a residence and the beginning point of his occupational program.

to the theory of the early existence in Western Asia of an Amorite empire or general influence and of the primitive occupancy of Palestine by this dominant race, I announce it as my belief, that the builders of Shechem were Amorites; that they migrated into Palestine from the cradle of the Semitic races in the north, and that at a time not later than the middle of the third millennium B.C.; that they were originally of the same Semitic stock, or kinship, as the Hebrews and Babylonians; that, at first, they were monotheists in religion, and so remained for centuries after their settlement in Canaan; and that, primitively, they shared with the other Semitic peoples the traditions concerning creation, the Garden of Eden, the fall, the deluge, and the genealogies of the patriarchs, substantially as they are now found in the book of Genesis. The Hebrews alone preserved their heritage in these traditions.

These synthetic conjectures seem to be necessitated by the most obvious meanings of Biblical statements concerning these so ancient peoples. These statements are the materials with which we primarily must work, as it is these statements that we expect to find confirmed in the last analysis of our scientifically created data. But a remark pertinent to this conjunction. The use of the word science in connection with Bible criticism and interpretation, while categorically justified, is yet often productive of invidious inferences and provokes a serious mental interrogation. The schools have seen fit to divide Bible research and study into sectors and departments, and to treat each of these as efficient and ends. But engagement with the Bible is not so much science as history, and this history is a whole, both as to its content and the conclusions read from its record. That treatment which does not deal with the whole must

break down in the effort to verify its details. Criticism must be held to this rule. It must account for the cultic phenomena of those most distant times of the antediluvians, as it must rightly discern the records created by those later agents of revelation who devoutly believed the traditions of their so distant forebears. The writers of the Old Testament accepted unqualifiedly the record of antediluvian monotheism.

During all the decades of the crucial period of Bible discussion, roughly speaking the century lying immediately before the World War, conservative scholars looked back toward the ages of antediluvian and early postdiluvian monotheism, described in Genesis, as toward a land separated from us by an impassable gulf. Extant critical literature contained no record and critical science no data, from which a reckoning might be pushed back to those separated ages. The most distinct voice of criticism was one which denied the existence of primeval monotheism, and affirmed the impossibility of any monotheism except such as develops evolutionally from polytheism and nature worship. But very many have believed the record concerning those very ancient worthies who "began to call upon the name of the Lord," and have held that a halfway house, standing on the untrodden way leading thereto, might yet be reached, and from which the messages of a dependable testimony might be relayed back to the house of the present. Do I mean that Shechem is that halfway house? The evidence in hand is that Shechem brings us within sight of an antiquity that had not wholly lost its ideal of the one God, whose unity was the essence of the worship of the more enlightened members of the most ancient race of mankind.

The climacteric discovery at Shechem was that of

the temple of *El-berith*, which is to be discussed further on, but must here be brought forward as a necessary link in the argument. The antiquity of *El-berithism* cannot be doubted. Its original monotheistic character is testified to at Shechem, in the absence, in the lowest stratum, of full evidence of fetichism or idolatry.² In an article, printed in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* of October, 1926, I gave it as my belief that *El* was the name for the Deity, as used by the earliest Semites, evidenced in the name of Babylon (*Bab-El*, gate of God), and in *El-elyon*, the name of the God of Melchizedek, as also in the cosmic appellative, *Elohim*. The Melchizedekian period of Salem corresponded with the period of the stay of Abraham at Shechem. At both places the worship of *El* prevailed. Abraham, the undoubted monotheist, as well could have sacrificed in the temple of *El* at Shechem as at the altar at Salem, which latter it is clear he did.

From the standpoint of both natural science and religious tradition, it cannot too often be said that monotheism has not arisen as an evolution out of polytheism, but polytheism is a corruption of monotheism. Whatever law there is in evolution is the law of advance from the particular to the general, and this law is con-

²In his final report on the excavations conducted at Shechem last summer, and printed since this article was put into type, Dr. Sellin says, concerning the ancient temple of the "Covenant God" (*El-berith*): "From the south, one proceeded in olden times easily along a walk; but after the later rebuilding on a stone stair, . . . before which a door $3\frac{1}{4}$ meters in breadth led into the sanctuary (*Kultraum*). This room 11 meters broad, by $13\frac{1}{2}$ meters long, was divided by two rows of pillars into three naves. In the middle nave, between the two middle pillars, though a little behind their binding line, once stood an image [*Gottesbild*] on a round stone base .40 meters in diameter. . . . Naturally, of the image itself no trace was found. . . . Of particular finds, the temple was as bare as the palace; also here, at or after the first destruction, restoration from the foundation had taken place. . . . To every Bible student is well known what great significance the 'house of *El-berith*' had for the Canaanites, and also for the people of Israel. . . . In spite of its present wrecked condition, it is a find of epoch making importance."

stantly the law of degeneracy. Where this degeneracy in nature is arrested, it can be only through a dynamic persistency, categorically described as "the survival of the fittest." Religion is the result of a spiritual dynamic revelation. The critics in dealing with the evolution of religion utterly overlook this aspect of the law of survival. Shechem becomes a distinct illustration of cultic decline. Not only in the Israelitish deposits are there evidences of defection from the Jehovah worship of the period of Joshua and the conquest, but in the earliest Amorite stratum the tokens of a monotheistic, or, at least a semi-monotheistic, worship slowly sinking into fetichism are constantly seen. *El* worship was the original cult of Shechem, and gave a curious tinge to the multiform idolatries which succeeded. Baal-berith followed *El*-berith. There also is evidence that in the Israelitish era Jehovah and Baal were worshiped at the same altar. The Israelitish religion was the dynamical survival of the fittest, both through tradition and revelation.

But we must now take up the history of Shechem in an order inverse to our just completed review, but natural to the order of the events themselves. Already, I have adverted to the fact that the founders of Shechem were of the Amorite race. A thorough presentation of this view cannot now be undertaken, but it is important to know that the Scriptures throughout favor the claim of an Amorite origin and occupancy. Jacob expressly affirms that the inhabitants of Shechem in his day were Amorites (Gen. 48:22). The name Amorite is identified with *Amurru*, found on the monuments which assign them (the *Amurru*) to the stock of the earliest and most powerful people in the Asiatic west land.

That peoples known collectively in the Scriptures

as Canaanites were of this powerful race is now generally accepted. The eponymous Canaan, son of Ham, accounts for this collective term. The whole Canaanitish group, thus described, was a cognate of the ethnically aligned Semitic family, a branch which, with the Babylonians and the Hebrews, primevally occupied the lands in the region about the Taurus and the Ararat mountains. The names and racial distinctness of these branches are the accidents of their separate migrations from the parent habitat. It will be noted that the Amorites of Palestine are (in Gen. 10:16) claimed as being of the family of Ham. This, undoubtedly, is true concerning the eponymous headship of Canaan, a son of Ham, as noted above. The same is true of Nimrod, eponymous head of the Babylonians. But the term "Semite," as used ethnically and historically, is not exclusively applied to the direct offspring of Shem, but to synthetic groups of early postdiluvian descendants of the general Noahic family. The crossing of later patriarchal lines accounts for the genealogies of Genesis.

When the Amurru group, or Amorites of the south, reached the median of Palestine, in the Ebal-Gerezim terrain, they were already, as it would appear, in a state of cultic transition from primitive monotheism to polytheism. The worship of the *Els* was, as we have seen, the cult of Shechem. El-berithism, which is testified to by the uncovering at Shechem of the temple of El-berith, represented the twilight zone between monotheism and polytheism—not an emergence from polytheism toward monotheism, but a sinking into the former from the latter. When Abraham and Jacob formed their separate conjunctions with the Amorite community at Shechem, this was the state of the Amorite cult. The stealthy worship of the "strange

gods," or *teraphim*, by the servants and harem of Jacob, from which he purged them on leaving for Bethel, was fairly typical of the local religious state at this time. It was a syncretism of El-berithism and fetich worship. The Shechemites had declined from strict monotheism, but had not yet plunged into the gross idolatries of the time of Jeroboam and Ahab. Herein is the significance of the Scripture: "The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Some have interpreted this passage to mean that, of all the nations of Canaan, the Amorites were the most violent, unrestrained, and godless. The opposite is true. They were, as Bible history indicates, the highest type of the aborigines. In the characters of Hamor, Mamre, Melchizedek, and probably Jethro and Job, the ancient monotheism and integrity of Amurru prevailed; but the racial decline from these was nearing the point of completeness.

The Baal-berithism of the time of Abimelech was a recent lapse from Jehovah worship. At Shechem the excavators uncovered an altar which appears to have been dedicated jointly to Jehovah and Baal. In all its transitions, the consciousness of Shechem never quite lost the memory of its primeval monotheism. It was only in the most corrupt of the Israelitish periods, that of Ahab, that it completely abandoned the simplicity of the worship of the ancients.

The theory supported in this paper necessarily antagonizes three or four of the capital contentions of the old critical hypothesis, namely: The Bedouin, or north Arabia, origin of the Hebrew race; the development of the Israelitish religion from fetichism or nature cult; the Babylonian origin of the Old Testament stories of creation, the Garden of Eden, the fall, the deluge, and the patriarchal genealogies; the late writing of the

Pentateuch, and hence the impossibility of Mosaic authorship. But besides being indifferent to the anticipated removal from court of these causes of pragmatism, I am assured that my reasoning and its conclusions rest upon two critically dependable sources of proof, to wit, the records of the Old Testament and the archeological situation developed at Shechem.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

THE AUTHORITY OF BIBLICAL TRUTH

AN IRENICON

By REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D., LL.D.

THE truths contained in the Christian Scriptures may be considered under two categories, historical and spiritual. Historical truth rests upon the testimony of the sacred writers.

The records of the Bible, however, which are primarily historical, are oftentimes the integument of spiritual truth. This fact has given rise to the suggestion of degrees of inspiration within the Bible. Inspiration possesses such a vital quality that wherever present it can be immediately discerned by the spiritual consciousness; but the attempt to partition it into degrees leads into a sphere of psychology too subtle to yield clear and valuable results. We prefer to explicate the underlying thought in the mind of those who plead for "degrees of inspiration" by using the expression, degrees of spiritual fertility, as indicating the varying spiritual quality, and unequal possibilities of human profit, to be found in different portions of the Bible.

One advantage of this phrase is that different degrees of spiritual fertility are open to the experience and observation of every thoughtful Christian. Moreover both Modernists and Fundamentalists give the right of way, especially in their devotions, to certain portions of Scripture as containing more spiritual enrichment than others. Compare, for instance, Psalm 23 with Psalm 109, particularly from the 6th to the 15th verse. There is nothing akin to shepherd care in the imprecations of the latter passage, nor can they afford equal spiritual nourishment.

In the nature of divine revelation essential or spiritual truth is of primary interest. In the final analysis the Bible is devoted to making known God for the purpose of developing human character Godward. It is therefore profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. While both the intellectual and spiritual powers of the human mind are correlated in the study of essential truth, in the final result spiritual perception must dominate. So much is this the case, that if all the contents of our sacred books were accepted as the inerrant product of infallible dictation, they would be futile to produce moral conviction or stir the soul to religious enterprise, unless the spirit of man possessed a power of perception corresponding to the vital spiritual truth contained in the objective revelation.

Fifty years ago or thereabouts students for the ministry began their study of the Christian Scriptures with the prepossession, that the collection of writings included in the Protestant Bible was made by God Himself and given to men with the warning, that, under penalty of losing their share in the tree of life and in the Holy City, they must not add to nor take away from its contents. In every part and in every letter the supposed claim of the Bible to perfect infallibility was conceded. Those who wrote it were simply the instruments of the Holy Spirit who Himself guided the pen of each writer to the exclusion of all error, historical or spiritual. There may have been some exceptional cases, but such was the mental attitude of the ordinary student at that time to what he unhesitatingly called the Word of God. The Bible was the final authority from which neither conscience nor reason had any appeal.

To make an attempt to show the palpable impossi-

bility of intelligent belief in such a proposition would in the end be a barren victory because such confidence is not in the infallibility of any translation now in use, but in that of an ancient text which is quite inaccessible to those who profess to believe it.

In his study of the letters of Saint Paul to the Thesalonians and Corinthians, the student soon found that these potential saints were exhorted to judge for themselves and to prove all things. "I speak as to wise men," said Paul; "judge ye what I say."

Proceeding to the study of church history, the student found that the early Protestant Reformers seized with audacity the vital principle of Protestantism, liberty of conscience, and were not so much concerned about the literary infallibility of the Bible as they were anxious to bring religion back to inward faith in Christ and to test theology by Christian experience. They believed that the true authentic Christianity was that which regenerates and saves the entire man, and that the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians was more essential for life than any creed of the church. To them the authority of the Bible rested upon its re-creative power, not its literary infallibility. If they saw human imperfections in it, they were soon lost sight of in the glory of its saving truths.

Luther declared, "Christ is the Master, and the scriptures are the servant." "Here is the true touchstone for testing all the books; we must settle whether they work the works of Christ or not. The work that does not teach Christ is not apostolic, were Saint Peter or Saint Paul the writer."

Calvin taught that truth is recognized by its intrinsic character, and that the inward witness of the Spirit, which being the same as that which inspired the prophets, Christ, and His apostles, makes us imme-

diately feel that their words are divine and true. He said: "If we will indeed minister to the needs of consciences, and hinder them from wandering and vacillating in doubt and perpetual instability, we must seek the ground for our convictions in something higher than human reasonings, opinions or conjectures. I mean in the witness of the Holy Spirit."

The Protestant theologians of the period following the early Reformers lapsed somewhat from this liberty under the influence of a scholastic rather than an evangelistic spirit, but with the revivals under the Moravian Brethren and under Wesley and Whitefield, there was a return to the inward authority of spiritual truth with comparatively little concern for the credentials of external authority. They demonstrated by their evangelistic success that theology was not religion, nor could belief in any doctrine as such be construed as saving faith through Christ.

Another influence which affected the point of view of theological students of fifty years ago was the intervention of the critical theological novel. They had been brought up to believe that spiritual truth was inseparably associated with the literature of literal fact, and that it was almost an unpardonable sin to discuss spiritual verities in forms of fiction, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* being the only permissible exception. Apart from the Bible, Christian biography was their staple religious diet.

Touched by the literary genius of a new school of novelists, of whom George Eliot may be taken as the prototype, they learned that, while the books of the Old and New Testaments are admittedly the chief depository of spiritual truth, it is not confined to them alone. They discovered that this spiritual truth does

not demand any special literary form for its expression, and particularly that it was not necessary that the literature which conveys it should be true to historic fact. They became impressed with the conviction that it was the spiritual substance they contained which saturated great novels with their deep and abiding interest. They found that if the novelist knew the human heart and deftly played upon its keys, the reader would often feel impelled to break out, saying, "That's true; yes, that is true." Sometimes smiles alternating with falling tears would emphasize the skill of the literary artist as he brought into the bold relief of consciousness, through glints of moral heroism or otherwise, the secret truths which fire the imagination and warm the heart. The spiritual truth in the books certified itself to the criterion of truth in the heart.

Standing upon a pedestal of appreciation, as great novelists do today, it seems unfortunate that most of them fail to reach the innermost home of spiritual sensitiveness and converting power. Even A. S. M. Hutchinson, in *One Increasing Purpose*, and Philip Gibbs, in *The Eternal Quest*, scout along the byways of spiritual truth, but do not lead their readers into its very temple at the head of the street called Strait, where stands the shining cross of Christ, the only means of full redemption. Sometimes they seem about to approach it, but mysteriously and fatally miss the supreme opportunity of entering in, and so pass on. It may be their art forbids entrance into that holy place.

The aloofness to fiction inculcated by their early conception of Biblical authority prevented the students of half a century ago from realizing how fully, in teaching the people, Jesus sanctified fiction. For instance, the evangelist Saint Luke includes the story of the

Prodigal Son amongst the parables with which Jesus taught the publicans and sinners; yet the Master unfolded it as if in every detail it were an actual occurrence. Jesus was not careful to make any explanation of its truth as literal or otherwise. Its great purpose, however, has been fulfilled in bringing countless wanderers back to their spiritual home. That is its real importance; and its eternal message of love will be needed as long as human sin remains and inspiration to faith in the Eternal Father is needed by a doubting heart.

The immediate apprehension of spiritual truth, in whatever form it may be presented, conveys moral conviction. Much of the teaching of Jesus lies underneath the story. The truth He taught is found in what we learn from the story, not in the form of the story itself. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman says that, "He was the daring romancer who gave fiction great prominence in His mission as the divine Teacher and Guide of the race."

If we were to characterize truth as Jesus conceived it we would say, that it is a divine potency fused within the form of revelation which endows it with power to transform character. It bears the same relation to the form of revelation as the spirit of man does to the human body. It is its spiritual vitality. It emerges in the great and enduring hymns of the Christian church, of whatever denomination the singers may be. It is the unifying bond that lies beneath all Christian fellowship. It is the tie that unites in one family the children of God in all the centuries.

Indeed, the spirit of man has something akin to an instinct for spiritual truth. The horse in the pasture field has an instinct which guides him away from the poisonous herb and leads him to feed upon the nutri-

tious grass. It would surely imply a fracture in the scheme of divine Providence if lower animals were guided to maintain their physical life, while man, with an eternal destiny, is denied the secret of apprehending the true supply for his spiritual need. But indeed there is no such fracture. The discernment of spiritual truth is not withheld from any who seek it. "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Jesus says, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."

Jesus promised to send the Spirit unto His disciples to guide them into all the truth. This is not to be taken as an assurance that they might set themselves up as professors of universal knowledge—nothing so foolish—nor that they should be infallible in human judgment; but that they should have clear perceptions of all the truth needful to save the soul, to build Christian character, and to understand the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Nothing herein contained even questions the authority of God. It only seeks to open the way into the secret place where divine authority is most surely recognized and most deeply felt. Neither does anything herein contained disparage the supreme value of the Bible as in contrast with other books. It is the book of all books, the bread of life. It is the inspiration of all enduring human progress. It makes the way of salvation clear for the individual, and reveals the path of peace and purity to all nations. It treasures for the world the authentic Gospel of Christ and His apostles. Its truths epitomize all that is needed for the progressive

education of humanity until time shall be no more. Verily the Bible is the master light of all our seeing.

Its authority does not rest upon any single idea. In the order of proof it rests first upon its authentic history.

Although the spiritual truth contained in the Bible is infinitely and eternally more important to mankind than its historical testimony, there is a vast concatenation of evidence in archeology and secular history to prove the authenticity of its records. This evidence conveys to most men a large degree of assurance as to its spiritual authority and greatly assists or confirms belief in the whole book.

A feeling of authority is also conveyed by its power to inspire men. It proves its inspiration by inspiring to nobler life all who open their hearts to the influence of its truth. It is the most spiritually alive book in all the world. Its authority is also revealed through the heart experience of believers. This experience of inward peace and power is confirmed by the testimony of the church during the entire Christian era. The authority of the Bible over human hearts is also manifest in varying degrees, but with increasing clearness, in the fruit of its teaching in national and international life, never so much as today.

These credentials of Biblical truth are in no wise depleted because modern students of the Bible magnify the need of a spiritual eye fully to perceive its spiritual truth. The authority, however, is not in the eye that sees, but in the truth which is seen. The perception is only the means by which the authority of spiritual truth is with greater assurance brought to bear upon the conscience and spirit of man.

These converging lines of evidence produce a degree of moral conviction which is quite sufficient for that class

of persons which Jesus described as "of the truth," and who therefore are inclined to hear, understand, and obey it.

Implemented by the activity of conscience, this conviction becomes absolute authority so far as individual conduct and character are concerned.

But the capstone of authority for all truth, which is needed to fulfill the supreme purposes of the Bible, is found in condensed form in the personal teaching of Jesus. It is specially found in great sayings which rose directly out of the intuitions and inspirations which were His as the Son of God. They were the mind of God within Him, and were not acquired by His education or absorbed from His environment. He represented Himself to be the supreme center and epitome of all such truth. He said, "I am the truth," that is, 'In My personality, My character, and My doctrine is found all essential truth.'

Stanley Jones of India says: "The gospel lies in the person of Jesus. He Himself is the good news." To this end was He born, and for this cause came He into the world, that He might bear witness to the truth. He assumed final authority in revealing the Father. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "I am the light of the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." He never hesitated to set aside Old Testament authority when its teaching obscured the purity or fulness of His own more perfect message. How often He repeated, "It hath been said, but I say unto you."

The truth He taught contained everything essential to a complete body of divinity for His church. If peace is to possess the denominations, the time has come when the voice of God should ring over every collegiate class

room, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."

We are aware of the critical objection that the sayings of Jesus may not be truly reported in the Gospels, and therefore the Scripture record may bring us only a diminished authority. But it does not appear that this objection carries much weight. The supreme spirituality of His sayings must have come from Himself. It could not have been the invention of His admirers. We may need a better manifestation of the religion He taught, but we cannot conceive of a better religion than He gave us. As Strauss said, "He is the highest model of religion within the reach of our thought."

I will conclude by citing a story which David Lloyd George delights to tell. It is of an old Welsh minister who, on a very stormy night, preached in an out of the way neighborhood, which had been somewhat disturbed by higher criticism. At the close of the meeting a farmer's wife stepped to the front and said: "You will stay with us tonight? Our farmstead is some distance away, the road is rough and the night is dark, but we have a lantern that will light us home." As they walked along the minister noticed that the lantern was an old-fashioned one and that it had horn sides, also that these were badly dented. The good woman read the thought of the minister, and said: "Never mind the dints. It will light thee home."

Criticism may have made some dints in our views of the moral elevation and literal authenticity of certain portions of the Old Book, but is it worth while to have controversy between people who believe that the light in the lantern of divine revelation is sufficient to guide them all every step of the way home?

TORONTO, CANADA.

ST. JOHN OF GALILEE

BISHOP AT EPHESUS

By E. G. SIHLER

PRIMITIVE Christianity and its divine source are either a rock and a "possession for ever" or nothing. *Tertium non datur*. I propose here to present concisely, as far as we have data, not what has been offered by the kaleidoscopic series of conjectures—by the endless academic ambition to substitute something new for the faith once for all delivered to the saints (Jude 3), which in St. Paul's time was, and ever has been, foolishness to the Greeks—but what we know.

Nor must we pass by the Philo problem. Many of the higher and highest critics actually present it as the *raison d'être* of what they call the "Fourth Gospel," while the present writer, in the company of Dorner, Lightfoot, Alford, Westcott, Zahn, and many others, calls it that of John; and he does so also in a conviction not less positive than that of the Christian "witnesses" (or martyrs), Ignatius, Polycarp, and Justin of Sichem, who like Paul of Tarsus died for the Name at Rome.

The first witness of them all was Stephen—"And when the blood of Stephen thy witness was shed, I also was standing by and consenting, and keeping the garments of them that slew him" (Acts 22:20). Dr. B. L. Gildersleeve more than fifty years ago wrote as follows:¹

¹ In the age of Philostratus. See Dr. Gildersleeve's monograph on Apollonius of Tyana, republished in his *Essays and Studies*, Baltimore, 1890, p. 252.

"Hellenism and Christianity are grappling now as they grappled seventeen centuries ago and if the shape of the weapons has varied in the long struggle, the strategic points are unchanged." And the Christian religion, for many decades after Golgotha and Easter morning, in the eyes of men, both Roman provincial authorities as well as of the worshipers of the Capitoline Jupiter, was "only one of the countless foreign religions with which Orontes and the Nile had flooded the city on the Tiber."²

As I look back on more than a half-century's earnest and unbroken effort to master classic civilization through its own extant texts, its many religions so called, but more its morals and its philosophical sects, the environment (rather than the matrix) of nascent Christianity, and hold to it even more earnestly amid the lengthening shadows of life, the following thesis has assumed the position of axiomatic importance and authority: The essence of Christianity is Jesus the Christ, Saviour of the world, Son of man (Dan. 7), and the only-born (*μονογενής*) Son of God. This thesis cannot and must not be adjusted, modeled and molded and kneaded like ever new dough, to conform to the passing *philosophumena* of ambitious academic minds.

Even secular philosophy has ever been in a flux of successive *scholarchi*, each claiming finality. It is academic usage to say "history of philosophy," instead of sequence of speculation, as if it were a body of axioms like geometry or the elements of matter enumerated by chemists. These "philosophies" undergo metamorphosis; names flourish and fade and leave no genuine seed. Not long ago, reading once more Dr. George Salmon's survey of Gnosticism, I was greatly im-

² B. L. Gildersleeve: The Emperor Julian, p. 368.

pressed with a passage³ which might enrich the present page:

Every union of philosophy and religion is the marriage of a mortal with an immortal; the religion lives; the philosophy grows old and dies. [Dictionary of Christian Biography, Vol. II, p. 678. Salmon: Gnosticism.]

John, the son of Zebedee and Salome (sister of Mary), was born in Galilee, in Bethsaida or Capernaum (?) on the lake of many names. He probably was some ten years younger than Jesus. The *didrachmon*, or half-shekel (about thirty-five cents, American value), the annual temple-collection in Judaea as well as in all the Diaspora anywhere in the Mediterranean world, was paid by Jesus and Peter alone (Matt. 17:24 *sqq.*). We quote Exodus 30:13-14 (keeping in mind that the current coin, in the time of Christ, was Roman, a daily and galling reminder of a subjection crying out aloud for a secular Messiah): "A half-shekel shall be the offering of the Lord. Everyone that passeth among them that are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give an offering unto the Lord." And Peter alone, it seems, was already married. His impulsive nature and his greater maturity, not any designation for future pan-episcopal power, made Simon Bar Jona almost continually the spokesman of the Twelve.⁴ Speaking of this Temple-tax let us hear a voice strictly contemporary with the life of Christ:

The temple has as revenues not only sections of land, but even much greater other ones, which will not be destroyed by time. For as long as the human race shall endure, always will the revenues of the Sanctuary be guarded, enduring coequally with the universe. For it has been ordained that every year

³ Perhaps in writing he thought of Aurora and Tithonus.

⁴ Traditional Christian art has made most of them gray-beards, but not John, and venerable, as in Da Vinci's Cenacolo. Actually they were youths, like our Sophomore-Juniors, and, up to and beyond the Resurrection, more or less filled with the expectation of a secular Messiah, to give them high place.

those beginning with twenty years shall offer up first-fruits. The contributions are called "first fruits" [*ἀπαρχαί*]; hence, too, they give the first-fruits most eagerly, radiant and rejoicing. . . . It happens that as the nation [of the Jews] is most populous the first-fruits too are most copious. For almost in every town there is a treasury of the sacred fund, into which it is customary to enter and pay first-fruits. [Philo: *De Monarchia* II, 3:]

It was a living bond for the theocratic union of the Jewish race, not only throughout the Roman Empire, but also in Parthia, beyond the Euphrates.⁵

Thus we will better understand John 11:48. Whether we take "place" as the temple or as the Holy City, the "people" is that surrounding High Priest and Sanhedrim, with its ethnical and religious ramifications, as well as perennial sustenance, from the cataracts of the Nile and from the Caspian gates to the Pillars of Hercules. And Philo of Alexandria, in that cultural center of Hellenism, was still a Jew waiting for the Messiah:

And when they shall get this unexpected freedom, who, a little while before scattered [*σποράδες*] in the Greek and non-Greek world, over islands and continents, rising with a single impulse, some from this, some from that point, they all set out eagerly toward the one spot appointed [*De Execrationibus* II, 436, (Mangey)].

We recall the disciples going to Emmaus—"But we hoped that it was he which should redeem Israel" (Luke 24:21). And so, too, some thirty-four years before, Anna, a prophetess, at the presentation of Mary's child, "gave thanks unto God, and spake of him to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke 2:38).⁶ "If Jesus at the head of an

⁵ Philo: *Legatio* II, 578 (Mangey).

⁶ Cf. Matt. 19:27; Salome's petition for her sons (Matt. 20:20); Pilate's scornful superscription over the cross (Matt. 27:37); a nationalist pretender (Dan 9:25; Mk. 15:32; Isa. 40; Luke 1:68 *sqq.*; 2:11); Samaritans' share in the expectation (John 4:25).

army and as victor over a few Roman legions had entered Jerusalem, the same priests and Pharisees who demanded his crucifixion, would joyfully have cast themselves unto the dust before him."⁷

We may well assume that John spoke Greek early. Palestine at large, since Alexander, had been a mere sponge squeezed between the Seleucidae and Lagidae, between Alexandria and Antioch; in and near Galilee there were many Greek or semi-Greek towns. We mention merely Tiberias, Sepphoris, Tarichaea; further north, at the foot of Hermon, Panias (Caesarea Philippi), the Decapolis, Hippos, Pella, Scythopolis. From Gadara came one of the literary favorites of Tiberius, Theodorus, head of a school of rhetoric. Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon were not far away. Caesarea (Stratonis) was largely inhabited by a Greek population, I mean Greek-speaking. The name of the town Pella, between Gadara and Gerasa, was directly transferred from the old capital of Macedon.

The noted philologist of Yale, the late Dr. James Hadley (1872), in his day discussed the language currently spoken in Palestine at the beginning of the Christian Era.⁸ He urged that the less Hellenistic group of New Testament writers, viz., Peter, James, Jude, John, Matthew, did not acquire Greek first in order to compose their writings; the LXX in that period influenced Palestine much more than the Hebrew original, and proved a power abroad in the Diaspora. Our Lord's brief trial by Pilate, Hadley holds, was most probably conducted in Greek. So, too, He spoke Greek, we may assume, on His tours in Syro-phenicia and Decapolis.

⁷ Doellinger: *Judenthum und Heidenthum*, 1857, Regensburg, p. 773.

⁸ Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s.v. Language.

We may assume that the growing familiarity of young James and John with Isaiah and Daniel was in good part acquired through the synagogues, less through the professional "teachers of the law [*νομοδιδάσκαλοι*]," whose face was rigidly turned backward, who necessarily must have taught also the pre-Exilian Hebrew. These, we may conclude, had also a professional interest in the copying and sale of scrolls of Pentateuch, Psalms, and Prophets. Both Jesus and His pupils were rated as illiterate, or as ranking far below the standard established by teachers such as Hillel or Schammai or Gamaliel, the D.Ds. of those times. These young Galileans, seeking the "hope of Israel" (Acts 28:20), abandoned the Baptist and followed Jesus of Nazareth, soon to be proven Messiah of Israel "by powers and wonders and signs" (Acts 2:22). Now the High Priest at Jerusalem had supreme authority over synagogues,⁹ even in distant cities being a kind of *Pontifex Maximus*, even in "*partibus infidelium*."

On the data concerning John's personal history recorded in the Gospels and Acts we must not dwell here. When Paul, some three years after his conversion at Damascus (Gal. 2:9), for the first time, probably in the spring of 37 A.D., avowed himself a Christian to the leaders at Jerusalem, James, Cephas, John, who then "had the reputation of being pillars" of the mother church, John was probably not more than twenty-seven years old.

⁹The lofty conception of synagogues as set forth by Philo is well worth quoting: "There are opened wide on the Sabbaths, innumerable [*μυρία*] schools in every city, schools of wisdom and temperance and bravery and justice and the other virtues, [schools] in which they seat themselves in an orderly way, quietly giving keen attention . . . on account of their thirst for precious discourses; and some one of the most experienced rises and teaches what is best and bound to be profitable," etc. (*De Septenario* II, 282.—Mangey).

St. Paul, returning from Spain, at last laid his head on the block at the end of 66 A.D., or early in 67 (Zahn's computation). The Christians of Jerusalem and Judaea fled to Pella about 67. John and other disciples, such as Philip, also Aristion, migrated to the Roman province of Asia about 68 A.D., John becoming *episcopus* (overseer) and chief presbyter, by election, probably soon after. He died a peaceful death, under Trajan, Zahn thinks about 100 A.D., a nonagenarian, or almost one.

It is impossible to exaggerate the lasting and incisive importance of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the central theocratic organism—an influence equally epochal in the further history both of Judaism and Christianity, the exile of 70 A.D. being more incisive than the Babylonian which was terminated by Cyrus.

Christianity after 70 came of age. Gieseler, one of the most sober and cautious of modern church historians, calls the period of 70-117 A.D. "The Age of John", *i.e.*, of John and his immediate pupils and successors.

But before we proceed we should, with the aid of Wood's Excavations at Ephesus (1863-1875), strive to gain some closer vision of that city in the age of the Roman emperors. The temple of Artemis (Diana) was built and rebuilt, in all, three times, on the same grand scale, and was called the "Artemiseum" (*Ἀρτεμίσιον*). One of Alexander's successor-generals, Lysimachus, renamed the city Arsinoë, after his queen, but in vain. Pausanias (VII, 2, 6) states that the cult of the Ephesian Artemis was much older than the Ionic settlements on that coast line (*i.e.*, older than 1050 B.C.). The descendants of Androphilus, the Codricle of Athens, always maintained social pre-eminence in

Ephesus. "Even now the men of that family are called 'Kings,' having certain honors, such as front seats in games, and a purple garment indicative of their royal descent" (Strabo 633). The Artemiseum lay seaward from the town, distinct by itself. Near to it was the Sebasteion, or Augusteum, sanctuary of Augustus (and Roma). Both, it seemed, were enclosed in the same *peribolos*, or circumvallation, this having been built in 6 B.C., to be paid for and maintained "out of the revenues of the Artemiseum."¹⁰

Most official records in the period we are studying were bilingual, Greek and Latin. The *Ephesia* were annually celebrated in the month Artemisios (May). Every full citizen was enrolled in a "tribe" and in a "thousand." Over and again the inscriptions quote the title *Neokoros* (temple warden) and *Neopoios*, both for distinguished citizens and for the *demos* (people) collectively. Services of such "temple wardens" were often recorded by inscriptions or portrait busts which were placed in the temple by vote of council, or *ecclesia*. Even the city collectively was sometimes called "temple warden." Near-by towns like Smyrna were under obligation of certain "joint sacrifices." Among the tribes there was also an "Augustan" one.

The civil year began with the birthday of Artemis. The chief priestess was a maiden, but associated with her in annual routine was an *Essene*, who during his year of service had to maintain absolute continence and was also called *Histiator* (head of worship), closely associated with the city treasurer, *οικονόμος* (cf. Rom. 16:23). There was also an annual rite of *Proskynesis*

¹⁰ Imperator Caesar Divi f. [son of Julius Caesar] Aug. Cos. XII. Tr. Pl. XVIII Pontifex Maximus ex reditu Dianae fanum et Augusteum muro muniendum curavit C. Asinio Gall Pro Cos. (An inscription uncovered by Wood.)

(Adoration) on behalf of the community, executed by the *Essene* of the year. We have every reason to assume that the reigning Roman Emperor was coupled with Artemis on this occasion. So Salutaris¹¹ is called "Philartemis and Philokaisar." "Asiarchs" occur in these inscriptions (*cf.* Acts 19:31), men of ample wealth and social distinction,¹² who presided at certain public games and undertook the great cost thereof, not only at Ephesus, but in other cities of the Ionic Union, like Smyrna. Sometimes the city called an eminent "sophist" (professor) to conduct classes at Ephesus. Soteris of Athens¹³ was honored by students at Ephesus, who were of Ephesus, from Rhodes, Kilbani (in Lydia—Strabo 629), Hierapolis, Phokaia, Nikaia, Ankyra, Antioch, Kaunos. The central or representative position of Ephesus is impressive.

In Inscription No. 46 it is called: "First and greatest metropolis of Asia and twice temple warden of the Augusti." There were also processions, when images (*ἀπεικονίσματα*) of the goddess were carried from the temple through the city and back into the *Pronaos*, thus at every regular town-meeting or *ἐκκλησία* when the *Ephebi* joined in the procession.

Such the background of the Christians at Ephesus. It seems clear that no Jew or Christian could well become a legal citizen of Ephesus or remain one on conversion, in the age of St. John, Ignatius, and Polycarp. Further, the oath demanded in civil contracts and legal affidavits generally was, it seems, taken by the name of

¹¹ Inscription from the Theater, 36.

¹² *Cf.* the Aediles of Rome (Cicero: *Pro Scauro*). Lightfoot, in his Polycarp (Apostolic Fathers II, 2, p. 987 *sqq.*), quotes Modestinus from the Digest (I, 6, 14), showing that the Asiarchate was an ethnic priesthood, as were those of the "Bithyniarch" and of the *Cappadocarch*.

¹³ Wood: Inscriptions from site of temple, No. 11.

the ruling emperor.¹⁴ The enormous difficulty of living at all, even more so of carrying on mission work as leaders or as directed by leaders like John at Ephesus, stands out most impressively.

As to the question of priority of Revelation and Gospel together with Epistles, I must not enter the lists here.

In 66 B.C. occurred the foul execution of James, brother of Jesus. It is related by Josephus (*Antiqq.* XX, 9, 1) as having been decreed by the High Priest Hanan, before the new Procurator, Albinus, had arrived. The charge was that "James, the brother of Jesus called Messiah" had "transgressed the Law." He was, like Stephen, stoned to death. Agrippa II for this act deprived Hanan of the high priestly office. The *sicarii* were everywhere, active especially at the great festivals, their murders untraceable. Bandits in the adjacent deserts, religious fanatics expecting divine signs of national emancipation, internecine feuds at Caesarea between Greek and Jewish residents—the clouds of the catastrophe looming. At this time we may assume John migrated to Ephesus, which then, with Alexandria, was the most populous city of the Roman subject empire¹⁵ and, with Antioch, after the catastrophe of 70 A.D., the foremost genetic point for the Christian missions. Timothy was reckoned in Christian tradition the first overseer of Ephesus.¹⁶ It is not likely that he was still living. John was chosen, or elected, as then was the universal mode, and it is quite likely that the contiguous churches joined in the call.

¹⁴ V. Oxyrynchos Papyri, vol. II, 6, 183, in an affidavit of 66 A.D., e.g., by the name of Nero; on p. 184, on the part of a soldier, in 37 A.D. by the name of Tiberius; so too, in affidavits of income from stock, in the census, p. 195 *sqq.* It is countersigned by three officials in the twelfth year of "Nero the Lord."

¹⁵ Seneca: *Epist. Mor.* 102, 21.

¹⁶ Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 4, 5.

Eusebius ¹⁷ says, that the Apostle and Gospel writer John was still "tarrying on" (ἐνδυστρέβοντα) in life in the persecution under Domitian and relegated to Patmos. At the accession of Nerva, 96 A.D., the penalties decreed by the last of the Flavians were cancelled, and so John returned to Ephesus (*op. cit.* III, 20, 8). He lived to see the accession of Trajan (January-February, 98 A.D.). The pupil of John's pupil Polycarp, Irenaeus, so testified. Zahn, as we saw, places the death of John about 100 A.D. The story of the once Christian youth, reclaimed by John personally from a bandit's life, after John's return from Patmos, is transcribed from Clement of Alexandria by Eusebius. Herder versified it with lines of noble dignity. In Clement's version the returned Apostle accosted the managing presbyter at Ephesus as ὁ ἐπίσκοπε.

The much named and little known "Presbyter John" of Ephesus Zahn identifies with the Apostle, and if I may be permitted to enter my own opinion here, I have for some years inclined to assume this identity. The anecdote about the heretic Cerinthus and John's meeting in a public bath is familiar, but has little credibility.¹⁸ Cerinthus, it is true, may have been trained in the peculiar Hebrew-Greek philosophy of Philo of Alexandria, himself a contemporary of Paul and John.

As many critics, especially the higher kind, have suggested that John actually conceived the very design of his own Gospel as a rejoinder to Cerinthus, the Ebionito-gnostic who migrated from Alexandria to Ephesus (which theory I share not), I must summarize

¹⁷ (*H. E.* III, 18, 19.) When descendants of Judas a brother of Christ were summoned to Rome as being also Davidians, but were dismissed by Domitian that suspicious autocrat when he learned how slender their fortunes, how horny their hands.

¹⁸ *V.* Dictionary of Christian Biography, vol. 2, 448, article by J. M. Fuller. Hippolytus reproduces Irenaeus very closely indeed.

the points as given in Irenaeus (I, 11): That the creator-god was inferior to the First God, whom that demiurge did not know; that Jesus was not born of a virgin, but of Joseph and Mary in the manner of all mankind, but was more just and wise; further that transcendental power descended upon Him at His baptism, and that Jesus, from that point onward proclaimed the true First God and wrought miracles, but that His Messiah personality withdrew at the Passion from Jesus who alone suffered and rose again, while the Messiah remained unaffected by suffering, being a spiritual being.

Books have been written as to the chief design of the greatest and last of our Gospels—that it was conceived as the complement of the Synoptics¹⁹; or that it was written with a derogatory side glance at the Baptist's disciples (of whom probably there were not many left when John wrote his Gospel); or that it was a polemic against Docetism and Ebionism. The anti-Gnostic intent the eminent commentator Dr. Luecke claimed to behold particularly in the Logos presentation of the Prologue, a weighty matter indeed, but not recurring after the first chapter.

The Tübingians had their vogue, say, not quite up to the death, in 1860, of their founder and hierophant, the Hegelian F. C. Baur. Some three years later Ewald alluded to the work of that school as a blight and a field of desolation.²⁰ To Hegel history was merely the effort of God to reach self-consciousness, especially in the sequence of epochs and occasional human revealers of the "World-Spirit," as in Alexander, Caesar, etc. The itch, then, of the Suabians to inject Hegelian-

¹⁹ Dean Alford, curiously enough, went to an opposite extreme, that John did not know anything of the three older ones.

²⁰ *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1863, Aug. 5, in connection with his review of Renan's *Vie de Jesus*.

ism into the history of Christ (as into all history) guided or drove them into endless constructions and destructions, as thus: Thesis, Petrinism; antithesis, Paulinism (with Acts as a diplomatic effort at mediation) followed by the higher unity, the Fourth Gospel, the work of an impostor, which the church promptly swallowed, although the figment, pasted together out of the Synoptics, was put forward about 170 A.D. only.

The Gnostics were used by the Baurian school like clothes hooks in a closet, to suspend or properly place the Gospel. With Hegel and his school—we must not forget it—world and God were convertible terms. But candid self-inspection will not rest with the spider web of such metaphysical figments. “Restless is our heart,” said Augustine, “until it come to rest in Thee.” Our questions or apprehensions as to the concrete and most real things, sin and death, will not long be satisfied or soothed by academic abstractions, or professional concepts. There was nothing “*welthistorisch*” about Hegelianism, as his disciples claimed. The very term, “*voraussetzungslose Forschung*,” begs the question; the spiritual soul of man seeks adequate ends, just as the eye of his body seeks the light, or his lungs crave pure air, no matter what biological theories may prevail. And it was these, the highest quests of the soul, with which dealt the disciple whom Jesus loved. ‘Who do men say that the Son of man is?’

After all, it must, for those who assume His Name, be decided by the self-revelation and self-attestation of Jesus Himself. The majestic Prologue of John’s Gospel at once necessitates here an unavoidable digression, compact though it must be, on Philo of Alexandria²¹

²¹ Whom, by the bye, Josephus in his vast range mentions but once, in connection with the Alexandrian riots (*Antiqq.* 18, 9, 1).

and his speculative and varied utterances on the *Logos*. I fear there are not now many readers of Philo's allegories and his curious blending of Moses and Plato.

Whether the Stoics or Plato, especially in the *Timaeus*, influenced Philo's speculation more, may be left undecided. Also, how far, if at all, he was influenced by his predecessors, Jesus Ben Sira, or the author of Wisdom, who can decide? "As for Wisdom," he writes, "older not only than my own birth [*γενέσεως*] but also than that of the world, it is not permissible or possible for any one to judge her but for God and for those loving her unfeignedly and purely and genuinely."²² Sometimes Philo makes God directly the creator without naming any *Logos*, e.g., *Vita Mosis* III, 8, discriminating there between the creative and the ruling power of Him who is (II, 150—Mangey).

All visible creation—here we have Plato—is from an archetype immanent in God, as a human city is laid out from a pre-existent plan of an architect.²³ Sometimes Plato speaks in Philo, sometimes Moses: "Man was made in the image of God" (*op. cit.* 6; Gen. 1:27). Our world is material and the object of sense perception, whereas, the world of the *Logos* is immaterial and ideal. Moses ever casts his real meaning in riddles (*αἰνίγματα*), as in Exodus 24:10, where by sapphire our material world is meant. What Moses and the elders saw was not God, but, at least, His image, the most holy *Logos*—the true Philosophy.²⁴ Never does Philo's *Logos* (whether you take it as Word or Thought) approach substance, separateness, concrete reality, let alone Incarnation.

²² *De Humanitate* II, 385 (Mangey).

²³ *De Mundi Opificio* 4-5.

²⁴ *De Confusione Linguarum* 20, I, 419 (Mangey).

Again, speaking of the Cherubim figured in the Ark of the Covenant, he says: "But the divine Logos above these did not come into any visible form, since it is not like unto anything perceptible by the senses, but himself being an image [*εἰκὼν*] of God, the absolutely oldest of all intellectual existences" (*De Profugis*, c. 19, I, 561.—Mangey). The angel appearing to Hagar (Gen. 21:7) is a divine *logos*, and reflects God as the moon reflects the sun.²⁵ Again: "The Logos is the image of God, through which the entire universe was created" (*De Monarchia* II, 5; II, 225.—Mangey). Again: "This universe is the younger son of God, inasmuch as it is perceptible-by-the-senses; for the Son older than this one he called Idea." (*Quod Deus immutabilis*, c. 6, I, 277.—Mangey.)

The administrative reason (*logos*) of God is shown also in the succession of secular empires,²⁶ Greece, Macedon, and Persia before these; this cycle some people call "Fortune."²⁷ Again, "Of the father, God, . . . and of the mother, Wisdom, through whom the universe came into creation" (*De Profugis*, c. 20).

Philo's range of familiarity, with Hellenic culture in Alexandria, the most eminent center of Greek scrolls, of research and erudition, was wide.²⁸

²⁵ *De Somniis* I, 41; I, 656 (Mangey).

²⁶ Hegelianism before Hegel, or ideas possibly suggested from Philo's reading of Polybius.

²⁷ *Tyche*. *Op. cit.* c. 36; I, 298 (Mangey).

²⁸ On Philo, besides Zeller: History of Greek Philosophy, cf. Schürer in Britannica, 11th ed., and in his Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, 3, sec. 34, Scribners; Dorner's Christology, 2d ed., vol. I, 21 sqq.; Luthard's and Meyer's commentaries on John's Gospel; Watkins in Ellicott's series; J. G. Mueller's edition of *De Opificio Mundi*, 1841, and his monograph in Herzog: *Real Encycl.*, 1st ed.; Zöckler in the 2d and 3rd eds. of the same. I quote from the last one: "Particularly from the fundamentals and essential doctrines of Christianity, as regards the person and work of the Saviour, Philonism differs as much as possible. . . . With his concept of the Logos he [Philo] stands entirely on a Greek basis; the only thing he has in common with the Johannine Logos of the New Testament is the name."

The readers of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW may profitably compare (without any aid from Greek philosophers), on the creative Wisdom or Word of God: Psalm 33:6; Proverbs 3:19; 8:22-30; *Ecclesiasticus* 24; *Sapientia* 9, 1, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου.

But John's majestic presentation of the Christ is not essentially stronger or more positive than the following often cited but ever inspiring and consoling (Heb. 1:2-3): "His Son, whom he appointed heir of all things²⁹ through whom also he made the worlds; who, being the effulgence of his glory" etc. (ἀπαύγασμα, cf. *Sap.* VII, 26); or Colossians 1:15: "Who is the image [εἰκὼν] of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation: for in him [through him] were all things created"; verse 17: "And he is before all things"; and further on, Colossians 2:8-9: "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily [σωματικῶς]." ³⁰ It is the doctrine of the Incarnation, here taught by Paul not less definitely and distinctly than by John in his Prologue.

The great *Leitmotiv* of the entire Gospel, if I am not mistaken, is the personal witness-ship attesting words and works and, further, interpreting the spiritual meaning of the same in the maturity gained by many decades of missionary and homiletic labor. The urging of it all on John's hearers and readers is emphasized over and over again. So at the conclusion of the narrative of the Passion (19:33): "And he that hath seen"³¹ hath born witness and his witness is true, that ye also

²⁹ Cf. the Synoptic, Matt. 11:27.

³⁰ With Lightfoot's commentary, though I will not believe that Paul, writing in Rome, in his first captivity there, in the summer of 62, transcribed (or remembered) terms or phrases from Philo, when he had just warned the Colossians against being made sport of by philosophy, etc.

³¹ Probably the only one of the Twelve who remained near the cross on that day, and with Peter hastened to the grave, outrunning the older man (John 20:4).

may believe." And this direct witness-ship—no tradition from hearsay or from copying any other written account or other extant Gospel—is concentrated in John 1:14: "And we beheld [were spectators of (ἐθεασάμεθα)] his glory"—a summary of the three or four years of John's witness-ship. Now this insistence on the physical evidence recurs for us in the First Epistle, the very first words penned, the summary of the Gospel in a few momentous lines, throbbing with enthusiastic eagerness, in its syntax close to anacoluthon: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our own eyes, that which we beheld [ἐθεασάμεθα again] about the WORD of life and the life was manifested." He resumes his syntax a little further on.

How many times, we may well say, what countless times did the last and the most long-lived of the first delegates (apostles) of Christ begin or end his discourses in the province of Asia, or in contiguous Bithynia, with that great and sweeping asseveration! Did the Epistle precede the Gospel?

The term "my dear children [τεκνία]" occurs seven times in this general letter, with one exception embracing thereby all the members, young and old; it is the diminutive of affection, perhaps a homiletic habit of John's when himself an old man.

Here we may quite briefly refer to the note in Eusebius: "John who inclined on the breast of the Lord, who became a priest wearing the petalon, and witness and teacher" (*H. E.* III, 313). The High Priest's mitre—he came from Palestine, and his spiritual dignity, especially in the last decades of his long life and service gave him a pre-eminence freely accorded him among all and by all the presbyters and "overseers"; it

meant nothing further, I believe, than a transfer of honorary terms quite intelligible after the catastrophe at Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

But to proceed, avoiding controversy as much as possible,³² there is a personal strain in John's manner which I will call the habit of iteration, due, I believe, to his fervid earnestness. St. Paul is much more systematically dialectic and didactic. So in 1:1-2, there is no variation of phrase at all. Further:

"that he might bear witness" (1:7-8).

"the only begotten" (1:14, 18).

"He was before me" in 1:15 (*πρώτός μου*—*prior me*, Jerome; and 1:30).

"that every one believing in him shall have eternal life" (3:15-16).

"And I will raise him up on the last day" (6:44).

"This is the bread which came down³³ out of heaven" (6:58).

"My time is not yet come" (7:6).

"My time is not yet fulfilled" (7:8).

"They sought therefore to take him, and no man laid his hand on him, because his hour was not yet come" (7:30).

"And some of them would have taken him; but no man laid hands on him" (7:44; *cf.* 8:20).

"I am the door of the sheep" (1:7; 10:9).

"And I lay down my life for the sheep" (10:15, 17).

"He was moved with indignation in the spirit" (11:33, 38).

"that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people" (11:50; referred to verbatim in 18:14).

"And whatever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do" (14:13; *cf.* 15:16; *cf.* 17:6 with 9; 17:11 with 21).

"the disciple known to the High Priest" (18:15-16).

The adjective "manslaying" (*ἀνθρωποκτόνος*) occurs twice only in the New Testament, both by John, Gospel 8:44; First Epistle 3:15; the adjective "genuine,"

³² In the wonderful commentary of Luthardt, 2d ed., 1875, a vast proportion of his learning is directed at the Baurites and other neologists.

³³ In the first, *καταβαίνων*, in the second, *καταβάς*.

"true" (ἀληθινός) occurs twenty-three times in John's writings (five times only in all the rest of the New Testament), almost of equal occurrence in the Gospel and the Revelation.³⁴ Throughout his own Gospel he rigidly refrains from writing his own name, a wonderful delicacy due to reverence. One of the most characteristic features of John so different from the Synoptics is this: He furnishes a certain amount of personal exegesis and elucidation, while they, in the main, are recorders of notable words and deeds, and only partial at that, with little if any regard for chronological sequence.

Dr. Lightfoot, in one of the most luminous passages penned by him said: "I had directed attention to certain passages (Matt. 23, 37, Luke 13, 34) as implying other visits to Jerusalem, which those gospels do not themselves record, and therefore as refuting the hypothesis that our Lord's ministry was only of a single year's duration and was exercised wholly in Galilee and the neighborhood until the closing visit to Jerusalem,—a hypothesis which rests solely on the arbitrary assumption that the record in the Synoptists is complete and continuous. Thus the supposed difficulty in St. John's narrative on this fundamental point of history disappears. In fact the Synoptists give *no continuous chronology* [italics my own] in the history of our Lord's ministry between the baptism and the passion; the incidents were selected in the first instance (we may suppose) for purposes of catechetical instruction³⁵ and are massed together sometimes by connection of subjects, sometimes (though incidentally) by sequence of time: in St. John, on the other hand, the successive

³⁴ See in Grimm-Thayer's Lexicon s.v.

³⁵ Cf. Acts 1:1.

festivals at Jerusalem are the vertebrae of the chronological backbone which is altogether wanting to the account of Christ's ministry in the Synoptists." (Essay on work entitled *Supernatural Religion*, 1889, p. 131.) On the Apocalypse Dr. Lightfoot says: "It marks the close of what we may call the Hebraic period of St. John's life. . . . whereas the Gospel dates from the last years of the Apostle's life." (*Op. cit.*, p. 132.)

John, I said, frequently adds elucidations of his own to his narrative, personal additions, we may call them. In quotations I beg to translate the Greek text directly, *e.g.*:

"For Jesus knew from the beginning who are they who do not believe, and who is the one who was to betray him" (6:64).

"He was [actually] speaking about the temple of his body" (2:21).

"He meant Judas, son of Simon of Iscaria, for he was to betray him, being one of the Twelve" (6:71).

"for he did not wish to move about in Judaea because the Jews sought to kill him" (7:1).

"because his hour had not yet come" (7:30).

"This he said about the Spirit which those who believed in him, were to receive, because Jesus had not yet been glorified" (*i.e.* through resurrection and ascension 7:39).

"They did not understand that he meant the Father to them" (8:27).

"For the Jews had already agreed together, that if any confess him as the Messiah, he should be excommunicated" (9:22).

A note identifying the Mary in the context, in 11:2.

Christ's interest in the family at Bethany, in 11:5.

What Christ had really meant (11:13).

The deeper, prophetic significance of Caiaphas' utterance, viz., "that Jesus was to die for his nation, and not for the nation only, but also that he might bring the scattered children of God into union" (11:51-52).

Why Judas made the remark about the rare ointment (12:6).

That the disciples did not understand His utterance at one time, but after He was glorified (12:16).

What Jesus meant by "being elevated from the earth" (12:32, to which add 18:32).

John explains the unbelief of Jesus' hearers in spite of the many signs Jesus had wrought before them with heavy citation from Isaiah, the entire context (12:37-42) being the amplest digression of actual exegesis in all of John's Gospel.

Comment by John on an utterance of Jesus (13:11), and on His remark to Judas at the Last Supper (13:28; cf. 18:9, 14).

About himself in the third person, beginning the narrative of Peter's denial (18:15 *sqq.*).

Further there are a number of antiquarian, topographical, lexical notes in John, notes for non-Jewish readers, unfamiliar with Palestine:

"Bethany³⁶ beyond Jordan" (1:28).

"Rabbi, which means, translated, Teacher" (1:39).

Kephas which is translated *Petros* (1:42).

Bethsaida, the town of Andrew and Peter (1:44).

"According to the purification of the Jews" (2:6).

"The *pascha* of the Jews" (2:13).

Going to Galilee He had to pass through Samaria (4:3).

The ethnical note in 4:9 is omitted in the *Sinaiticus*, but is absolutely pertinent *per se*—"The Jews and Samaritans have no association."

The Messiah, which means the Anointed (4:26).

The Galileans too, went to the Passover (4:45); "a festival of the Jews" (5:1).

The basin called *Bethzatha* in Hebrew (5:2).

The name "Lake of Tiberias" was the current later name (6:1).

The *pascha*, festival of the Jews (6:4).

Festival of Temple-dedication, in winter; colonnade of Solomon (10:22-23; cf. I Maccab. IV, 56 *sqq.*—in December).

The festival of the Jews, the feast of Tabernacles (7:2; cf. Deut. 16:16).

"On the last day, the great one, of the festival" (7:37).

Siloam, which means "he who is sent" (9:7).

³⁶ There were two. Cf. Kent: Biblical Geography and History, Scribner's 1922, p. 243.

Bethany, fifteen stadia distant from Jerusalem (11:18).

To a place called "paved with stones," in Hebrew *Gabbatha* (19:13).

Place of skull, which is called in Hebrew *Golgotha* (19:17).

"The day of that Sabbath was a great day" (19:31).

"As is the custom of the Jews to entomb," no cremation (19:40).

"On account of the Preparation of the Jews" (19:42).

"She says to him in Hebrew, *Rabboni*, which means Teacher" (20:16).

Clearly then John wrote for Gentile Christians who also, from Paul's foundation onward, seem to have constituted the bulk of the *ecclesiae* in John's actual province.

We have space here merely to glance at the impressive exactness of detail³⁷ in many of John's statements, *e.g.*: The narrative of Lazarus' resurrection, graphic and precise; what John and Peter found at the tomb; the position of linen, of the *sudarium* rolled up separately in one spot; Peter as usual more resolute in demeanor; the entire twenty-first chapter, an *epimetrum* with a scrupulous detail—what Peter did at the fishing; the vessel about 200 cubits from shore; coal fire on the beach; the catch, 153 large fish; His manner of dispensing the bread; etc.

If then John lived into Trajan's first years, the attestation of the divinity of Christ, John's central doctrine, as we find it in Ignatius³⁸ of Antioch, is clear and

³⁷ Which becomes doubly significant when we observe that John selects only a small number of miracles, but presents them with a precision and specific exactness overwhelming in their own compelling truth. Cf. John 20:31.

³⁸ The great edition of Lightfoot has been studied by the present writer with grateful appreciation. The theory of forgery of Ignatius' Epistles is now abandoned. Critics are, however, unable to fix the exact year of the conveyance of the Bishop of Antioch by imperial soldiers from Antioch by way of Ephesus, Smyrna, Troas, etc., to Rome; the computations extend from 105 to 117 A.D.

sweeping (about 107 A.D.). Passing over the incessant warnings against the Docetists, a heresy gravely threatening the belief in the physical actuality of the Saviour's saving passion, let us briefly quote some of this martyr's utterances as to the divinity of Jesus. Likewise is the Virgin Birth frequently asserted. I cite briefly:

"Of Jesus Christ our God" (Eph. 1).

"Having assumed the knowledge of God which is Jesus Christ" (Eph. 17).

"For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived by Mary according to dispensation from the seed of David and the Holy Spirit" (Eph. 18; Luke 1).

"In the blood of God" (Eph. 1).

The virginity of Mary and her birth (Eph. 19).

"Of God revealed in human form" (*ibid.*).

"For Him who by the flesh is of the race of David, the Son of man and Son of God" (Eph. 20).

"Who before the ages was with the Father and in the end [*i.e.*, the fulness of time] appeared" (Magnesians 7).

"Who is His Word [*Λόγος* (John 1)] having come forth from silence" (perhaps a homiletic point as often before made by the Bishop in sermons).

"The mouth that knew no falsehood by which [mouth] the Father spoke" (John 1) to Romans (Preface).

I noted some specific references to John's text:

"For He knows whence He comes and whither He goes" (John 3:8, in letter to Philadelphians 7).

"He Himself being the door to the Father" (John 10:9, in Philadelphians 9).

Jesus "was in the flesh even after his resurrection" (*cf.* John 20:21; Phil. 3).

Christianity, when it is hated by the world (John 7:7; Rom. 3). The most dangerous thing already at this time for Christians was and had come to be the *Name*: "Having heard that I am in bonds from Syria in behalf of the *common Name* and hope" (Eph. 1; *cf.* Matt. 10:22).

So in Antioch, then, so in Bithynia of which the younger Pliny was Proconsul, having been appointed

by the same Trajan who condemned Ignatius. I refer, of course, to Pliny's report officially submitted to Trajan (X, 96), a letter so often quoted, analyzed, discussed, from Tertullian to the present time. And the date of Pliny's proconsulate was quite close to the time when Ignatius by easy stages was being conveyed to Rome; probably Pliny governed there, 111-112 A.D. or the following year.³⁹ Prusa, Nikaia, Nikomedia were the chief cities. Is it not more likely that the Gospel of Christ was brought there from Ephesus in Paul's or in John's, time. We can here dwell but on a small number of salient points. Pliny does not know at what age criminal responsibility for confessing Christ was to begin. Shall remorse and recantation free the culprit? The cultured and gentle Pliny sent those to execution who persisted in claiming the Name. What were the "shameless crimes associated with the name" (*flagitia cohaerentia nomini*)? Those claiming Roman citizenship were marked (precisely as was Paul before Festus, in 60 B.C., Acts 25:12) for conveyance to Rome. We notice also the Emperor-cult associated with that of the gods; provincials, it is clearly seen, had to be ready at any time to attest their loyalty by a sacrifice of wine and incense presented before the reigning Emperor's bust. It is quite absurd, after the evidence of John and Ignatius, for editors of Pliny's Letters to claim an interpolation in the words, *Quod essent soliti stato die* [Sunday, no doubt, the κυριακή ἡμέρα] *convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem*, probably antiphony and *responsorium*. The *agape* also seems to be referred to (as in Jude 12).

It remains for me to survey briefly the attestation

³⁹ Cf. Mommsen: *Hermes* III, p. 31 *sqq.*

of John's Gospel, such as we trace it, in the half-century or more after St. John's death. Basilides,⁴⁰ of Alexandria, one of the earliest Gnostic leaders (besides definite references to Paul's Epistles, Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, to the contents of Matthew, and possibly to 1 Timothy and 1 Peter), according to Hippolytus,⁴¹ wrote: "Let there be light!" (Gen. 1:3), and this, says Basilides, is what "is said in the Gospels"—"was the true light which lighteth every man, coming into the world," *literatim* identical with John 1:9. (Basilides, like Philo, quoted Homer, and Plato's *Phaedrus* on the feathering of the soul, and Aristotle.) Further, from John 2:4, *verbatim*: "Mine hour is not yet come." How Basilides and the other Gnostics abused Christian Scripture, for the construction of their various figments of theosophy, does not concern us here.⁴²

In closing this study with the noble apologist and former Platonist, Justin Martyr, who escaped the Gnostics in that process of leaving philosophy for Christ, we take pleasure in avowing our indebtedness to the edition by Georges Archambault of Justin's Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon.⁴³ As a rule Justin is content with making points, without literal citation:

On the Virgin Birth and the pre-existence of Christ (43, 1, quoting Isa. 53:8 from LXX; 45, 4).

"And became man through the Virgin" (48, 2; 66; citing Isa. 7:13-14; cf. Justin 68, 6; 84, 1).

⁴⁰ Flourished about 125 A.D. Cf. Westcott, Canon 7, ed. 1896, p. 301 sq.

⁴¹ In the slender remnants preserved (many of them *verbatim*) by Hippolytus, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*, ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, 1859, VII, 22, p. 360.

⁴² We may as well add that Basilides, *op. cit.*, p. 374, cited the immaculate conception with the precise text of Luke 1:35.

⁴³ Paris, 1909, 2 volumes. The Tübingians in their day questioned the authenticity of this great treatise because it interfered with their theory of the Fourth Gospel.

"Him who was God before the creation of the world" (56, 10).

"I say that He [Christ] did nothing and discoursed nothing but what God willed Him both to do and discourse" (*cf.* John 12:49; Justin 56, 11).

"The Word [Logos] of Wisdom, being itself the God begotten of the Father of all, and being both Word [Logos] and Wisdom and Glory of Him who begot Him"—the essence surely of John's Gospel; and citing for his Jewish interlocutor Tryphon from Proverbs 8:22-36.

"As His blood was not begotten from the seed of man, but from the will of God"—a virtual, if not a verbal, citation of John 1:13 (63, 2).

"They who pierced him" (John 19:37; Rev. 1:7; Justin 63, 2).

"The spring of living water" (Jesus and the Samaritan woman, John 4:10; Justin 69, 6).

The Jews called Jesus "one who leads the multitude astray" (John 7:12; Justin 69, 7).

"And with us, a certain man, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, in the Revelation which occurred to him" (citing Rev. 20:4-6; Justin 81, 4).

"And you say that he pre-existed as God and by the will of God was made flesh" (*σαρκοποιηθέντα*. John 1; Justin 87, 2).

"Some assumed that John the Baptist was the Messiah" (John 3:15; Justin 91, 4).⁴⁴

The attendants cast lots for His garments (John 19:24; Justin 7, 3). "The power of resurrection which He has, having received it from His Father" (to give His life and to resume it—John 10:17; Justin 100, 1).⁴⁵

The Jews say: "When the Messiah appears, one will not know who he is"—a slightly inaccurate reminiscence from John 7:27 (Justin 110, 1).

From the First Epistle of John (I, 3, 1): "That we shall

⁴⁴ Incidentally Justin says that the Jews still approved the crucifixion of Christ and cursed those who pointed out that He was the Messiah (93, 4).

⁴⁵ For once Justin quotes an important New Testament text *literatim*, in c. 100, 1, viz., Matt. 11:27, which, as noted before, is virtually a syllabus of much of John's Gospel. *Cf.* Dorner's Christology, 2 ed., German, vol. I, p. 85. He adds Luke 3:16; Matt. 20:28; 26:28; Luke 7:35, 11:49; Matt. 23:34; 11:19. The Lord's self-attestation there is not essentially inferior to that in John's Gospel.

be called children of God and we are so" (1 John 3:1; Justin 213, 8).

From the First Apology of Justin we quote: "This the Logos, being divine, wrought" (10).

"The Word [of Christ] was a power of God" (*ibid.*).

We say that "the Word, which is the first-begotten [*πρῶτον γέννημα*] of God, was born without sexual copulation" (c. 21).

"Jesus Christ alone has specifically been born Son to God, being His Word and First-born and power" (c. 23).

"For through what reasoning would we believe a crucified man, that he is the First-born to the unborn God?" (c. 53).

"No one knew the Father but the Son, nor the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son would reveal" (John 16:3; Justin, c. 63).

That Justin designates the Gospels as "*Apomnemoneumata*" is, on the part of the classical Christian, a slight courtesy to the memory of Xenophon and his master Socrates. So Arrian wrote the *Apomnemoneumata* of his ideal, the Stoic lame philosopher Epictetus. Justin even praises Socrates and Herodotus (I Apol., c. 46).

From the second Apology I will cite but one passage: "For we worship the Word [Logos] of the unborn and ineffable God, after God, and love Him, *since He became man for our sake*, in order that, having become a sharer in our sufferings also, He may make remedy therefore" (c. 13).

The anonymous Epistle to Diognetus, probably a little earlier than Justin's apologetic works, affords a few points which should be here appended: "The almighty and all-creating and invisible God, Himself from Heaven settled truth and the holy and incomprehensible Word [Logos] among men, and firmly fixed it in their hearts; not, as some human being might conjecture, having sent some servant or messenger or commanding person, or some one of those who handle terrestrial affairs, or some one of those entrusted with the celestial managements, but He sent the craftsman Himself and workman [*demiurge*] of the universe, by whom [*ϕ*] He also created the heavens," a majestic echo of the first chapter of John, I dare say.

Tatian, pupil of Justin, later a Gnostic, constructed a "Blending of the Four" (Gospels), perhaps a system of pericopes, originally designed for churches in Syria.

This Diatessaron began thus (fragments preserved in Latin): In principio erat apud deum, et deus erat verbum. Hoc erat in principio apud deum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil quod cumque factum est. Per ipsum vita erat, et vita erat lux hominum. (Cf. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, etc., vol. I, Erlangen, 1881, p. 113.)

NEW YORK.

THE CHALLENGE AND COMPENSATIONS OF THE COUNTRY PREACHER

By HENRY W. McLAUGHLIN, Director of the Country Church Department
of the Presbyterian Church in the United States

THERE are not many preachers serving country churches because it is their deliberate choice. The charge has been made that the ministers of this new age are not sacrificial, but that they are seeking easy places, fat salaries, and public applause. It is difficult to believe that American manhood would shrink from a task because it is arduous. Especially would it be hard to convince us that American men who have become ministers of the Gospel are unwilling to make sacrifices. The dire need, the potential opportunity, and the leadings of the Spirit are plainly the determining factors which actuate the majority of the ministers of Christ in choosing their fields of service when they have once been challenged with the facts.

With a few exceptions ministers are honest, genuine, and conscientious in deciding upon the calls which come to them. Most of them sincerely want to follow Him who said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." Most of them desire to walk in the steps of Him who had not where to lay His head and gave as the crowning evidence of His commission, "The poor have the gospel preached to them."

These men who have given up worldly pursuits to enter the Gospel ministry have done it with the consciousness that it was not for pecuniary reasons. They

are followers of Him whose urge led His footsteps to the Garden of Gethsemane and by the Via Dolorosa up to Calvary. The reason more ministers do not volunteer for country church work, as some do for the foreign field, is, I believe, partly because preachers have not been challenged with the call to the rural task.

THE NEED

There is a challenge because of the need. The need of the country is very great because of the large number of children who are born and reared in rural districts. In 1925 there were 710,000 births and 288,000 deaths, leaving a natural increase of 422,000 in rural America. Large families in the city are very rare except in homes of alien races. There are not many children born in apartments or flats or in the residences on the boulevards. United States statistics show that there are 4,000,000 more children among 32,000,000 of the farm population than among an equal number of urban people, and that there are 1,500,000 more children in the rural districts of America than in the cities.

Practically every child in every American city is within distance of a well-organized, adequately equipped, efficiently managed Sunday School, but there are millions of rural children who are far removed from a Sunday School of any kind, and there are millions more who have no Sunday School or church privileges under efficient, well-trained leadership. Investigations show that work among these rural children yields larger returns than anywhere else. Here is the good soil. If the seed is sown, it will yield some a hundredfold, some sixty, and some thirty.

There are not many city or town churches vacant

because they cannot secure preachers. When any self-sustaining urban church becomes vacant there are a number of men who would be glad to accept its pastorate. The vacancy problem is almost entirely rural. Short pastorates and long vacancies are the curse of many of the country fields. Probably the majority of the country churches are served by men who live in the towns and give an occasional preaching service, but fail to develop any actual community consciousness or vital religious life among the people.

The first, and urgent, need of the country church is a resident ministry. Gill and Pinchot's study, *Six Thousand Country Churches in Ohio*, has proved beyond dispute that the *sine qua non* for the successful, growing country church is a minister who understands country people and identifies his life with the community. He must live among his people and become one of them. It would be impossible for a city church to succeed with a pastor who lived among farmers and conformed his life to the standards of the country. It is just as unreasonable to expect a country church to grow when served by a preacher who lives in the city.

All investigations render proof that, if the country church is to grow and accomplish its real mission, it must have a resident minister who will identify his life in a sympathetic, understanding way with his people, a minister who has a real program and will carry it out in a conscientious, efficient manner.

Dr. S. L. Morris, Executive Secretary of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, says:

The absentee pastor must be discarded. The professional preacher who comes once a month, chiefly to augment his salary, is a mere makeshift, a hireling minister. If the country

is to be resuscitated the church must produce a new order of ministry. The spirit of Christ must again become incarnate among men. Ministers who live where they do not preach, and preach where they do not live, should be barely tolerated. Men who consider themselves "buried alive" in a country charge should be discharged. If college-bred and seminary-trained men are unwilling to serve, except in a city charge, prayer must be made to the Lord of the Harvest to raise up a new order of ministry "taught of the Spirit", and "filled with the Holy Ghost". Definite sacrifices must be made. The Rural Survey remedy prescribes: "The preacher and his family must make their sacrifices as definitely as if they went to China or to Africa to preach the Gospel". It is easier to die a martyr's death, than to endure the lifelong martyrdom of a sacrificial life in an obscure pastorate. If "volunteers" wish to test the extent of their sacrifices and the reality of their heroism, let them deny themselves the privilege of going to the foreign field, and yield themselves in real sacrifices for destitute country places, where the people "are scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd". Let the Church challenge her most promising men, and see how many will respond. If the Church can secure volunteers of this character, it will be comparatively easy to save the country church.

The hope of a nation is to have a sufficient number of the right kind of rural communities; the right kind of rural community must have the right kind of country church in it; the right kind of country church must have an educated, cultured minister, consecrated definitely to the task. He must identify his life with the scattered people of God's open. He must have a sympathetic understanding of their problems and needs. The requisite of the age is to enlist and send to the church in the wildwood, the wayside church, the church in the grove beside the road, a ministry equipped and qualified to put on a program to meet the needs of the country people of this new age; a program that will also attract from the crowded streets of the cities people

who love to worship in the quiet spots, "where nature blends with music sweet to lift the soul from care."

Second, the need is for a minister who is a volunteer, and not a conscript. He must give himself definitely to this task in God's open among his scattered people, as others do to the foreign mission field. He must be willing to bury himself. He must believe that it is better to please God than to get the plaudits of men. He must learn that it is a bigger business to mold character than to become distinguished in the profession of preaching. We are persuaded that a man who is doing a real task in the country cannot be buried. The only way to redeem the country ministry from its ignominy is to do the work in such a big way that the results will convince the church and the world that it is a task worthy of recognition.

John Frederic Oberlin, a Ph.D. from Strasburg University, gave his life to the backwoods people in the Vosges Mountains in northern France. A man of unusual talents and highly educated, he spent his lifelong ministry in that rigorous climate, where the people were ignorant, poor, and "ironheaded." Oberlin today is known throughout the world as "the patron saint of the country church." He was made a member of the Legion of Honor by Louis XVIII for services which he rendered during his fifty-three years' pastorate. It was an expression of appreciation for the work of transformation which he had wrought upon the community where he labored. He also received recognition from the Emperor Alexander of Russia. When in 1819 an officer bore a message from Pastor Oberlin to the Emperor, the Emperor embraced him, saying, "This is for Father Oberlin." When he was called to a city church with a generous salary his reply was,

"The best work for me is where I can do the most good with the least recompense."

Richard Baxter, poor in health, spent most of his life at Kidderminster, a poor country parish, but neither he nor the public seemed to think that he was buried. The author of devotional books second in fame only to those of that other country man, John Bunyan, Baxter's name is still a household word and Kidderminster a shrine which draws countless pilgrims. Charles Kingsley spent his life as pastor at Eversley, an uninteresting English rural village, but did not long remain buried. Men and women from all over the world made their way to that out-of-the-way sanctuary to hear Charles Kingsley preach. Nor did he heed the calls to larger places, which followed close on the heels of great repute. The elder P. H. Mell was forty years pastor of two country churches in Georgia, meantime refusing calls to half the larger city churches in the South. If he was "buried" Southern Baptists showed persistent obtuseness in recognizing it, for they elected him president of the Southern Baptist Convention fifteen times. [Victor Masters: *The Country Church in the South*, p. 106 f.]

The country preacher today who has a real consecration to his task, and he who turns a deaf ear to the call from city pulpits will preach to great congregations, not only to the people who will come from the countryside, but those who will come on good roads from nearby towns and cities. People love to worship in a church among the trees, out in the open, away from the noise, odors, and other distractions of the city. There is something about a temple in God's great out-of-doors that makes one more reverent than in the most costly cathedral erected by the hand of man. Our age is calling for Oberlins and Kingsleys to preserve the country churches and to save the generation of today and, through them, that of tomorrow. Dr. J. W. Skinner, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church for 1926-27, gave his life to home missions in western Texas. He is a con-

crete example of the fact that you cannot bury a man who does his task in a big way.

Third, the country church needs an educated ministry. There is a conception that anyone will do for the country. When I was pastor of a church in the city of Louisville, Kentucky, the court appointed me a probation officer, and there were assigned to me about a dozen boys from the Cabbage Patch, made famous by Alice Hegan Rice's book, *Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch*. These boys had been arrested for various charges and released on probation. It was my duty to have them report to me every Saturday. They brought their reports from the schools showing their attendance and their grades. I used to take them into the house and have a little talk with them. I gave them some books to read. One day I met the mother of one of the boys on the street, and asked, "How is Henry getting on?"

She said, "Oh, Henry is doing fine. He has been reading those books that you loaned to him. He says he is going to be a preacher."

"I am perfectly delighted," said I.

"Yes," she replied, "I think he might as well be a preacher. I don't think he will ever be fit for anything else."

Her conception of the ministry is like that which some people have of the work of the country preacher. They have an idea that, if a man is not fit for a foreign missionary or a teacher or an evangelist or a city pastor, his place is in the country. We must get rid of the notion that any "stick" is good enough for the country church. It is my opinion that the fields which are most promising in the building of the Kingdom of God are out in the country. They have possibilities because all

other forms of service are dependent upon them. Here are born and reared the men who will be the leaders in the world of tomorrow. We need our most gifted, our most consecrated, ministers in these country fields.

There may have been a time when men without education could serve acceptably in the country, but that time is passing. We are living in the midst of a great rural renaissance. Automobiles, trucks, telephones, radios, electrical developments, good roads, rural free deliveries, parcel post, agricultural magazines, county agents, home demonstration agents, farm organizations, co-operative associations, Smith-Hughes schools, agricultural colleges, extension service, nearly all belonging to our generation, constitute some of the reasons for the renaissance. The most potent factor has not been mentioned, and that is the grade and high schools which we find all over America, with modern buildings, up-to-date equipment, and teachers who are required to conform to high educational standards. Attention should be especially called to the large number of consolidated rural high schools.

An uneducated, non-resident or inefficient ministry cannot qualify for the needs of this new day. The educational program in the rural South is rapidly becoming that of the twentieth century electric light, while the program of many of our churches is that of the nineteenth century oil lamp.

Educational advantages in the country have not been equal to those in the city, but the establishment of the consolidated rural high schools, with the coming of good roads and the use of trucks, is bringing very rapid improvement. These are some things among the rural people of America which constitute a challenge to the church to furnish an educated and well qualified

ministry. These young people who are getting an education must have a new order of ministry. They have lost respect for the ignorant man who pretends to be a spiritual leader. They must have somebody adequate to lift the torch of truth to guide their feet.

The church must send properly equipped preachers who are willing to give up the creature comforts and identify their lives with the scattered people. There is a call for the minister in this new day to turn a deaf ear to the plaudits of men and bear the stigma of being "only a country preacher," and to follow the footsteps of the Man of Galilee who had compassion on "those who were scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd."

HARDSHIPS

There is also a challenge because of the hardships. The minister who volunteers for the country church work because he feels it is an easy task will be doomed to disappointment. It means sacrifices, hardships, and deprivations.

1. It often involves isolation from congenial social contacts. The minister who is a college and seminary graduate may have the society of but a few who have been accustomed to cultural environment. In some country districts schools are still backward and roads unimproved. Servants are no more, and modern living conditions have not been extensively adopted in the country. He is cut off from his brother ministers except on special occasions. Many of the people do not read, and the country preacher will find himself growing stale.

2. There is much to endure. The country minister will have to make long journeys, sometimes on foot or

horseback, for he will find at certain seasons the roads are impassable for a car. He will be exposed to heat and cold, sun and rain. He may find his work exhausting both physically and mentally. Being a country preacher means hard work.

3. The salary of a country minister is usually very small. He may be cramped in buying sufficient books, magazines, and other things necessary for an efficient ministry.

The man who becomes a country preacher from choice deliberately dooms himself to the lowest level in the matter of salary, the back bench in religious conventions, and the humblest seat, if he gets any at all, in denominational councils. If the county seat preacher gets a salary of from \$2,000 to \$5,000 a year, his perhaps equally capable country neighbor, ten miles away, will be lucky if he gets a fourth as much. In my own state and denomination the country preacher is three times as numerous as his town brother, often equals him in ability, and frequently surpasses him in loyalty, but in forty years he has had the privilege of preaching the annual Convention sermon just one time, and that more than thirty years ago. [Dr. Jeff D. Ray: *The Country Preacher*, p. 18.]

There ought to be some plan by which country ministers could receive more adequate support. In one denomination the suggestion has been made, that each church which pays its pastor more than twenty-five hundred dollars be asked to raise an amount equal to the excess of twenty-five hundred dollars paid the pastor to be applied on a fund to supplement the salaries of country preachers. This is proposed as a token of appreciation and gratitude on the part of the city churches for the annual contribution which the country makes to the membership of the city congregation by certificate.

If one-tenth of the money contributed by the members who go from the country to the city churches were

given to supplement the salaries of country preachers every country field could have a resident pastor giving it all his time, and city churches would receive a large dividend on such an investment.

4. It is not isolation or hard work or small salaries that constitute the greatest hardship, but the stigma of being "only a country preacher." As has been said, it is the common conception that when a man accepts a country church he does so because no other form of work is open to him. He is usually looked upon as a second or third rate man. I have frequently been asked by strangers, "What or where is your work?" I have usually said, "I am a country preacher." It has been amusing to see myself shrivel up in the estimation of the questioner.

The contempt and pity in which the country preacher is held by the world, and even by many in the church, is the severest of all hardships to endure.

COMPENSATIONS

1. There are joys that come to the minister in communion with nature and nature's God. I love the country, I love its fields bedecked with a robe of God's wild flowers, its forest fragrant with the rich aroma of the herbage, its hills musical with the chant of the waterfalls, its mountains that force one to look upward, pointing heavenward like giant fingers. I love the wild life of the lone places and the domestic creatures which animate the fields and transmute the grass into food and clothing for the people of the earth.

I love the simple, sincere ways of country folk, where community of interest and unity of purpose undergird the solidarity of the home in which boys and girls grow to manhood and womanhood, apprentices of their parents. It is here they learn the lessons of

economy, integrity, independence, industry, initiative; it is here their bodies grow strong on an abundance of wholesome food and ample exercise suited to the varying stages of their lives. Yet they learn the secrets of sacrificial living. It is not strange that from such environment and such homes, if the religion of Jesus has found its rightful place there, there should be born and reared the leadership of the race.

Rev. Tertius Van Dyke, a lover of nature, recently gave up a pastorate in New York City for that of a rural village, and *The Literary Digest* said of him:

His father has won a great following by his faith in the true and the beautiful and simple things of life. The son could do no better than to follow his footsteps. And entirely apart from his own inclination, which seems to have been a controlling factor in the decision, there is just as much chance for useful service in the country as there is in the city, and perhaps a greater need for it. [June 26, 1926, p. 30.]

The city preacher may get more glory, but the country preacher will pass through experiences which will develop grace. The city man may exult in the works of man, but the country preacher may meditate upon the creations of God.

2. There is the loyalty and the love of the people whom he serves. The country preacher will be loved, honored, and appreciated in spite of gray hairs, failing health, and faltering steps. If a man wants to be comfortable at his task after he is fifty, he should spend his earlier years as a country pastor. The ministrations of the years have born fruitage in the lives of those who are his friends indeed. Their loyalty and their love will stand the test of old age and the vicissitudes which come with the years. The city preacher may get more headlines, but the country preacher has fewer heartaches. The city preacher may get more praise,

but the country preacher gets more peace. The country preacher may be poor in funds, but he is rich in friends.

3. One of the great compensations which come to the country preacher is the knowledge that he is a maker of men. Many of the youth to whom he has ministered will be filling positions of great responsibility and usefulness. Roger Babson says,

Statistics show that most of the great bankers, manufacturers, and merchants of America are the sons of farmers and preachers. Go through the list of bank presidents of Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit, Cleveland, or even New York. Were these men born in the city the finances of which they are now directing? They were not. Moreover, they probably were born in no city, but—if not ministers' sons—were born on a farm. City children often don't have to work. Boys brought up on the farms become great captains of industry because they early form habits of honesty, industry, and thrift. These great basic factors cannot be learned from books, but only through the actual daily work such as boys get under a good father and mother on a farm. The farms are the best and greatest schools and colleges of America.

What is true of men of finance and industry is true also of leaders of every other sphere of activity in the world's progress. The presidents of our big universities, presidents of our colleges, editors of our big dailies, molders of thought of the leaders of tomorrow, were mostly country boys. A traveler on the Jefferson Highway between Charlottesville and Staunton, Virginia, will be attracted by the sight of a very beautiful Episcopal Church out in the open country. Nearby on the opposite side of the pike is an old country home in which there once lived a family of beautiful daughters. One of them is today probably the most constructive leader in advocating beneficial legislation in Great Britain—Lady Astor. She expressed her estimate of

the value of the country church by providing for the community in which she spent her happy girlhood this well appointed, commodious edifice.

It is a compensation and source of real inspiration, which comes sometimes amidst the hardships and discouragements, when the country preacher realizes that, week after week, he is dealing with boys and girls who are to be the men and women of destiny in the world of tomorrow.

4. It is in the country that the preacher may find his own best development. He has time for study and meditation. He will grow strong in body, virile in mind, and will have the opportunity to develop the gifts of leadership as he seeks to train others for leadership. A preacher is profoundly influenced by the character of the people to whom he ministers. In the country he will preach to sympathetic, attentive audiences who will appreciate real sermons. There is a subtle but real influence that emanates from the audience to the speaker. An atmosphere is deadly where people are unresponsive or antagonistic. A congregation with itching ears, which desires sensation and entertainment, has a tendency to make of a minister a time-serving, man-pleasing preacher. People who crave instruction and spiritual enlightenment will make of a man an edifying and inspirational preacher.

In the country the message means much to the people. I know some rather unlettered countrymen who can tell the content of sermons they heard years ago. The country preacher has the compensation of knowing that his message is appreciated. He has the pronounced reactive influence of sympathetic and appreciative hearers upon his own development as a preacher.

5. The country preacher usually has the joy of

seeing his children becoming useful and honored men and women. New Providence Church in Virginia was organized in 1746. Seven pastors had preceded me when I became its minister, in 1909. In the one hundred and sixty-three years up to that time there had come from that manse two United States Senators, one United States Minister to France, one distinguished law professor, two physicians, two Bible teachers, four wives of ministers, nine preachers, and four foreign missionaries.

There are hardships connected with a ministry in the country, but we believe that the joys far outweigh the sufferings. The country preacher has learned the secrets of sacrificial living. He can say with Paul, "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision," and again, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Old age to him is satisfying. The bells of memory will be ringing; they may recall the years of long ago when he had the privilege of bringing certain youths, now valiantly carrying on, to know Christ and of training them in the principles of Christian leadership.

There will come to him visions of the days when he visited and brought comfort to lonely homes in times of sorrow. Perhaps it was to a discouraged tenant farmer whose crop had failed, or to a land owner burdened with debt. Perhaps it was in the time of sickness or when the death angel had crossed the threshold of the home. He is rejoicing in the consciousness of the gratitude, loyalty, and love of those he has tried to serve.

The shades are lengthening. Day must draw to a close. To the faithful, sacrificial country preacher, the promises of Holy Writ are his possession, "but it shall come to pass, that at evening time there shall be light" (Zech. 14:7).

WHAT VERSION IN THE PULPIT?

By DR. CHARLES L. GOODELL, Secretary of Evangelism and Life Service of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

FOR most Protestant men and women past fifty years of age there is only one version of the Bible. They learned its majestic passages in their childhood and in their estimation it has no competitor. For the greater part of the Protestant church today there is one version which satisfies as no other, and they long to hear it read from the pulpit. What a vindication three hundred years has brought to the fifty-four translators of that ancient version!

Years ago, as I stood in the dim light of the Jerusalem Chamber in Westminster Abbey, where one of the groups of great scholars translated the King James Version, I tried to put myself in the place of those ancient men. I imagined them questioning as to the verdict of scholarship and of the common people three centuries after their death. Would their version stand, or would the world condemn it and some other supersede it? Would the books of the canon still maintain their place, or would some be taken out and others added? I pictured to myself those old students wiping from their eyes the dusty sleep of three centuries and going into the old chamber with palpitating hearts to learn what had happened to this child of their heart and brain. I saw in imagination the sixty-six books in their vellum cloaks troop into that ancient chamber. I heard their spokesman say to the anxious and trembling translators, 'Do thyselfes no harm, for we are all here!' Not a book and not a chapter missing; and for substance of doctrine, not one fundamental change!

Whatever verbal changes have appeared have had as little to do with the integrity of the great volume as a speck on the brawny arm of Michaelangelo's David has to do with the beauty and power of that great statue.

With the advent of the American Version in the eighties our youth in college, and especially in theological schools, were taught that it was more accurate and scholarly than the old version, and the influence of all young pastors was sought in order to supersede the old with the new in the pulpit. To read from the American Version was supposed to be the mark of a scholarly and up-to-date minister, and one was quite averse to being caught with the old version lest, when great preachers, bishops, and secretaries filled the pulpit, the pastor might be considered behind the times and lacking in scholarly instincts. Nevertheless, there was still a protest from conservative scholarship and much more from the common people. The Episcopal Church in the main stood out against the new version, but there were many of the leading pulpits in the land, in some sections a majority, which adopted it for public use.

With the passing of the last generation both the English and American revisions have themselves been revised. Now we have the Weymouth, the Twentieth Century, the 1911, the Goodspeed, the Moffatt, and twenty others. Now your up-to-date pulpiteer does not wish to be so far behind the times as the American revision, which is more than forty years old, so he makes the saints and sinners sit up and take notice as he reads in the language of the street the up-to-date message of the last reviser and hopes he is translating what the Bible really says into a language which he who drives a truck or plays in a jazz band can understand. Even the dignified scholarship of a Moffatt has changed

Jerusalem of blessed memory to David's burg. One cannot help wondering whether the mutations which have taken place in Czardom would not indicate that in the next New Testament revision, to be perfectly up-to-date, Jerusalem ought to be set down as Herodograd.

Now when a child memorizes verses for a Sunday School prize, what version will be expected, and will the judges be so familiar with all the versions as to know whether the quotation is accurate, and will all the versions be accepted as of equal merit as to learning?

What is the consensus of opinion concerning the changed attitude and practice in the pulpit? This in brief: From a wide acquaintance with the pulpits of the country, North and South, East and West, we have found a marked movement toward the restoration of the King James Version for pulpit use. The common people, now as ever, are, in the long run, the arbiters of custom and, to speak exactly, of theology as well. So it was in Luther's day, so it was in Bunyan's day, and in the times of Wesley, and so it is in ours. The common people are asking that the Scriptures with which they have been familiar all their lives, which are imbedded in common literature beyond all power to remove, shall be the message they hear.

If the most up-to-date novelist were today to make a quotation from the Bible, it is probably safe to say he would use the King James Version. All the Bibles, Testaments, Gospels, and Epistles sent out by the American Bible Society are the King James Version; except a few thousand copies of the American revision which they print from plates of the company owning them. The Authorized Version far exceeds the combined circulation of all the revisions. It is the King

James Version which is used for the most part by our newspapers when they print daily, as many of them do, passages from the blessed Book. The latest report from the British Bible Society is, that ninety-five per cent. of the Bibles they issue are of the King James Version and five per cent. of the English revision.

It is well for us to remember how the King James Version came to occupy its place of supremacy. There were many other versions of the Scriptures when it saw the light. This, that, and the other version competed for supremacy, but after the passing of the years, and before the generation of the translators had passed, that version came to be almost universally adopted in England because it was so far superior to all others. The position of the common people is buttressed also by the finest scholarship of the country. Perhaps no man is more widely acknowledged as a master of English literature, and at the same time of the Bible itself, than Professor William Lyon Phelps of Yale. This is his estimation of the value of the King James Version:

Priests, atheists, skeptics, devotees, agnostics and evangelists are generally agreed that the authorized version of the English Bible is the best example of English literature the world has ever seen. The Elizabethan period—1558-1642—was the most important era in English literature. This is the period of Shakespeare, of Spencer and of Bacon, but the crowning achievement of those spacious times was the authorized version of 1611. It is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet as its foundation. This means that we ought invariably in church and on public occasions to use the authorized. All others are inferior. Revised editions and modern versions may be used as checks and comments, but wherever the Bible is read aloud, let us have the noble, marbly English of 1611.

He further reminds us that the Pilgrims brought as

their Bible the King James Version, which was then only nine years old. That version was the source of the literature as well as of the religious development of New England and of the civilization that has become the model of the world. No man can estimate the influence upon America of the Bible which the Pilgrims brought. As for English literary style, no book has been comparable, in its influence upon the writers of Great Britain and America, to the King James Version of the Bible which the Pilgrims read in the cabin of the Mayflower. It was that version which saturated the thought of our great American writers. It is in almost every line of Whittier; and Longfellow, Lowell, and Holmes are full of it; Emerson is forever quoting the Bible and finishing his sentences with its words; Hawthorne is steeped in the Bible. The great orators, Sumner, Wendell Phillips, Edward Everett, and Daniel Webster drop into Biblical language in every oration, and it is the language of the King James Version. Their style, rich and opulent, chaste and vigorous, was founded upon it.

We have a better Bible than the French, the Germans, the Italians or the Spaniards. Our English Bible is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. "The only way to explain it is that the authorized version was inspired."

Professor Dallas Lore Sharp says that the King James Version is still today the best source of pure, idiomatic, and simple English. "The Bible is the humanest book in the world. The King James Version is the greatest book in English literature. There is no substitute for it, nothing to take its place. No revised, modernized, storyized version, nothing yet devised or to be devised will do at all for the old authorized Bible."

It is true without doubt that the American Version and some of the twenty-five other revisions may translate some given passage with a clearer shade of meaning than the King James Version, but none of them compare for a moment with the English of that version. To keep these translations in the study for reference and for comparison is well, but one might as well talk of resolving Browning's masterpieces into blank verse in order to get a better word, or changing, "Then felt I like some watcher of the sky," because the poet names the wrong watcher.

Perhaps no sin of the American revision is more unforgivable than the substitution of *Jehovah* for *Lord*, a three-syllable name of a tribal God which nobody knows to this day how to pronounce—to put that in the place of the thrilling word *Lord* which three centuries of repeating of the Shepherd Psalm has set so deep in the thought of men that we have never heard any venturesome pastor undertake to repeat in the pulpit that glorious poem, the greatest ever written, and mar its beauty by interpolating *Jehovah* in the place of *Lord*. While Moffatt utterly repudiates the use of *Jehovah* for *Lord*, he has a substitute of his own, which is no better. He also uses throughout in place of *Lord* a word which indicates only one of the functions which for three hundred years the church has enshrined in the word *Lord*. Moffatt's word is *Eternal*, still a word of three syllables and with a limited meaning. The stately Eighth Psalm instead of beginning, "O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is they name in all the earth," reads, "O thou *Eternal One*, our Lord, what majesty is thine o'er all the earth." Even Moffatt cannot quite bring himself to duplicate *Eternal* in that first line.

If one wants to see how infinitely superior the glori-

ous march of the King James Version is to the halting step of later translations, let him read Moffatt's Twenty-third Psalm:

The Eternal shepherds me; I lack for nothing. He makes me lie in meadows green; he leads me to refreshing streams and revives life in me. He guides me by *true* paths as he himself is *true*. My road may run through a *glen* of *gloom*, but I fear no harm for thou art beside me; thy *club*, thy staff, they give me courage.

No wonder that Edward Newton, the critic, comments: "‘Glen of gloom!’ What wise man was it who remarked ‘Beware of the pitfalls of alliteration.’ Verily the doctor is beside himself; much learning hath made him mad.”

It was of the King James Version that Huxley said: "Consider this historic fact that for three centuries this Book has been woven into all that is noble and best in English history; consider that it has become the national epic of Great Britain; consider that it is written in the noblest of English and that it abounds in exquisite beauty of literary form." It is a matter of more than passing interest to know that Huxley, who was not a university man, learned Greek when he was past middle life in order to read the New Testament in the original, as well as to see what Aristotle wrote about the chambers of the heart.

It was the King James Version to which Edwin Arnold referred when he said, "The Bible has had more influence on my literary style and on my conceptions of life than all other books combined."

It was of the same version that Cowper sang:

A glory gilds the sacred page
Majestic like the sun,
It gives a light to every age.
It gives, but borrows none.

It was of the same Authorized Version that Macaulay said: "The English Bible alone suffices to show the whole beauty and power of the English language."

With this Book before him what wonder that John Milton should say: "There are no songs comparable to the songs of Zion; no orations equal to those of the prophets; no politics like those the Scriptures teach."

It was the King James Version that John Ruskin learned and that his mother insisted he read through by himself each year.

It was Dean Swift who affirmed, "The translators of the English Bible, masters of style, were much better fitted for that work than any we see at present."

It was of the King James Version that Webster said: "I have read the Bible through many times and I now make a practice of going through it once a year. It is the book of all others for lawyers as well as divines. If there is anything in my style to be commended, the credit is due to my love of the Scriptures."

To have proper appreciation of the King James Version, one ought to know what it did for the English language. We speak of the spacious days when Elizabeth and Shakespeare were stepping upon the stage. England was a nest of singing birds—Shakespeare, Bacon, Ben Johnson, Beaumont, Fletcher were making their contribution to that glorious thing we call English literature. "It was then Britannia began her glorious rule upon the sea. To establish her empire she needed a common language, good alike for the common people and the cultured. That the Bible of 1611 supplied. No book ever has had, no book ever can have the influence of that English Bible."

It is maintained on many sides that nothing has had

larger influence in producing an unsettled feeling concerning the integrity of the Bible than the introduction of so many versions, each claiming to be the best, and, to the common mind, each seeming in some way to discount the other. It is easy to say this ought not so to be, and doubtless that is true, but as a matter of fact so it is, and that feeling can be obviated in part by the general use of what is without question the noblest version of the English Bible—the King James Version.

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

WHEN THE CHURCH TURNS IN EARNEST TO PRAYER THERE IS reason for hope. It is rapidly coming to be seen that she has been depending too much on her machinery. As Rev. Samuel Horton of England has put it, in writing on American religion, there is "a danger of placing too much emphasis on mechanics and too little on dynamics." But evidence increases that church leaders are becoming aroused to the tremendous need of "dynamics," and this of course means prayer above everything else. At the same time many people seem to be more concerned over the method to be adopted for the next ingathering.

A revitalizing of the prayer-meeting and a rebuilding of the family altar would soon solve the problem of the hoped for revival, and its particular form of manifestation would care for itself. It seems a little premature to discuss the channels into which a great flood of spiritual power ought to be guided, when the heavens have not yet yielded the downpour. Whether a spiritual quickening manifests its power upon people collectively, as in the time-honored revival meeting, or in the quiet one by one method of personal work, or in any other way, must remain to be seen. Meantime, what are Christians to do in the presence of the need for a great awakening? Bishop Theodore S. Henderson gives this answer, through *The Western Christian Advocate*, and while he writes for his own church his plea is adapted to the church in general at this time:

"Nothing could be more revealing and revolutionary in the spiritual life of the Church than to study together for the evenings of one entire week the richness of life in the promises of Christ on the place and power of prayer, and by contrast to reveal our spiritual poverty because of our defective prayer. Such a week must be approached in the spirit of a shepherd

with a wooing heart, and not like a woodsman swinging an axe with evident delight in felling the forest. If, in the spirit of pastoral fidelity, we can lead our people to see that prayer is the opening of the sluiceways of our spiritual life in order that God may pour abundant life through them so that our own lives shall be enriched and the lives of others abundantly blessed, we shall have started a revival of religion whose power will be felt to the uttermost part of the world."

"Dr. W. J. Dawson was speaking with prophetic insight when he said: 'There is much doing, and many run to and fro, and knowledge is not thereby increased, and there is little praying. And in the lives of Christians the same spirit prevails. Prayer has been crowded out of their lives as it has been crowded out of the Church by the pressure of restless activities, many of which are genuine activities in behalf of the kingdom of God. . . . Whatever value we may put as others put on public activity for the kingdom of Christ, of this we may be very sure, "God soon fades out of the life of the man who does not pray." In the last analysis, *prayer is intimacy with God*; it is the child's unembarrassed conversation with the Father.'"

IF SOMEWHERE IN THE BODY POISON IS BEING GENERATED AND is insidiously seeping into the blood stream until pain develops, the modern physician does not turn his attention chiefly to the point of suffering, but looks for the source of the whole trouble. In other words he treats primarily the cause, not the symptoms. The church does not seem fully to have mastered this principle. It is striving to relieve this and that social ill, symptoms of the carnal nature in man, while too often neglecting the central difficulty. Spiritual narcotics will not suffice.

The matter has been put very well by The Lutheran. After commenting on the inconsistencies of many church members as brought about by the unscrupulous methods of the business world, this paper proceeds:

"When one comes to consider what is wrong with the world in its many interlocked relationships, need we wonder that so much Christian thought is being directed toward devising ways and means whereby Christian ethics and ideals can be injected

into them? Whatever we may think of the methods that are proposed to 'Christianize the social order,' that it needs Christianizing no one doubts. But to involve the Church as an organized body in so huge a task, and to commit it to certain programs and policies, such as have been proposed in many quarters, would inevitably turn it aside from its more essential and fundamental task of making the Gospel a living power in the hearts and lives of men. There is where the weakness of the Church lies. It has applied so much of its energy to things purely external as to fail in large measure to apply the Gospel to the hidden life of the soul. There lies the Church's pre-eminent task. The more she applies herself to this task, the larger will be her contribution to the ethical forces that are designed to change the social order. She must have a care about entangling herself with ambitious movements to Christianize civil, social and industrial relationships lest in her effort to make the world more Christian she become more worldly.

"We must look for the remedy much deeper down. Water never rises higher than its source and the social order will be no more Christian than are the lives of those who make up the social order. The fault with most Christians is the dual life they are leading. They are one thing in the Church and a different thing in the social order. As units in that social order they fail to function as Christians. They have become slaves to the prevailing system of that order. They need to close up the gap that lies between what they regard as sacred and what they treat as secular. The harmony between the two needs to be restored. And right here again, Luther is quite modern. He insisted that every Christian should regard his tasks in life, however humble or mundane they might be, as a *calling*. He was not to look upon it simply as a selfish means to a livelihood, but as a service to mankind. 'You maid in the kitchen, you toiler in shop or farm or office, you mother in the home, you father charged with the duty of providing for your family, you educators and men in charge of state affairs, must regard your work as a service in behalf of others. In this seemingly secular work, it is as possible for you to please God as I who preach the Gospel.' This in substance was what Luther preached to his people on more than one occasion. 'Put the Christian motive into your chosen life work and make it your calling,' was his motto. That will cause the dual life of the Christian to cease as nothing else will. Fill your social

order with men and women of that sort and your social, industrial and civic problems will be solved. You can poultice the canker sores of the social order with a sort of Christianized ethical plaster; but the disease lies deeper down. You must get rid of the dual life most Christians are leading and the Church is here with its Gospel to apply the knife."

TO OBSERVE A NICE DISTINCTION IN TERMS, THERE IS SOME heresy in the church today, but more apostasy. To produce heresy, someone has to go to the trouble of working out a false doctrine—it takes thought and effort. But apostasy is just the easy-going drifting away from the truth—it is not enmity, but simply unfaithfulness. Heresy is the teaching of the few; apostasy the tendency of the many.

There are preachers against whom it would be almost impossible to bring a charge of heresy, yet they are apostate as to certain essential doctrines. They either misinterpret them or avoid them altogether. The layman who sits under such preaching must be unusually wide awake spiritually and well informed doctrinally not to become the subject of a sort of religious anesthesia.

Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney, in addressing the students of Union Theological Seminary not long ago, touched upon this idea when he made this plea for the recognition and proclamation of the doctrine of the Atonement:

"It is when we come to consider the redemptive content of the Gospel that I have no hesitation in declaring that certain sections of the Protestant church to-day are apostate. Please note that I did not say heretical, but apostate. It is not the perversion of the New Testament doctrine of redemption that troubles me so much, as the quiet dismissal of it. Even an heretical statement of the doctrine of redemption requires that with it there should be a statement of the evangelical truth, in order that what the man is repudiating may be made clear. But what we are now confronted with is a terrible silence as to redeeming love. Love is proclaimed and preached about as never before in the history of Christianity; but not the love of God in the only New Testament interpretation and statement of it, that is, love that bleeds, love that died, love that

substitutes, love that expiates and atones, love that redeems. That is what the New Testament means by the love of God.

"No man can preach faith in its highest definition without preaching the atonement, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, eternal as God himself, and as universal in its reach as human nature. When you talk of faith, let it be as the high New Testament definition of faith, faith in the bleeding Christ, faith that Christ died not merely to leave an incomparable example, not merely to melt my heart and move me to repent, not merely to confirm by his death the doctrines he had declared, but to take the sinner's place and drink the sinner's cup; to give sin its awful due, and yet mercy its longing desire; to enable God to remain just, and yet the justifier of them that believe in Jesus. That is the only kind of faith worth preaching about, faith in him who hath redeemed us not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ. My faith looks up to thee, thou Lamb of God!

"Make no mistake about it, for that glad triumphant faith in atoning and redeeming love there can be no substitute. That is the preacher's mightiest weapon. No genius, no industry, no learning, no research, no talents, no deep interest in one's fellow man can take the place of a personal faith in Jesus Christ as one's Redeemer, to be able to say to one's self, 'He loved me and gave himself for me!' and to repeat it, as Paul did, to others. As I have already intimated, we hear much to-day in the Liberal camp about 'personal experience' as the authority and ratification of religion. I, too, accept that test, but not in the way the Modernists use the term. By personal experience, I mean the experience at the foot of the cross, where Love bled and died for guilty sinners. The real division in Christianity to-day is just here. It is not as between modern and ancient modes of thought, nor between educated and uneducated men, nor between liberally minded men and reactionaries and bigots; but between men who before the cross of Jesus Christ have had their hearts melted in wonder, praise and awe, and men who, confronted by the same cross, 'care for none of these things.' On which side do you stand? Out of which experience are you going to preach?"

EVANGELISTIC WORK USUALLY SUGGESTS "REVIVAL MEETINGS," the time honored method of calling men to repent of their

sins and accept Christ as their Saviour. In many communities this is still an effective way, and it will doubtless continue to be one, at least, of the means of reaching the hearts of men with the Gospel message. The principles of mass psychology offer certain advantages for pressing home any great truth and inducing decisive action.

However it is equally true that, in an age that is highly strung, irritable, proud, sensitive, intellect-worshipping, sensation-glutted, old ways of presenting and emphasizing the religious appeal often find little response. Yet the Gospel is still effective, and it is still to be preached. How can this best be done? Bishop Joseph F. Berry writes in *The Christian Advocate* upon "visitation evangelism." He reports the results in those places where it has been tried as "really wonderful." This brief description of the method deserves the serious consideration of our churches generally:

"We might as well face the situation. *If unconverted people will not come to us, should we not go to them?*"

"That is exactly what evangelism of the visitation type aims to do. After much prayer and careful instruction Christians go out two by two. They make a house-to-house canvass of a designated territory. They distribute spiritual literature. They visit their neighbors and personal friends. They call upon newcomers. They discover church members who have become indifferent to their Christian obligations and are hiding away. They make personal appeals to unsaved fathers and mothers and to the young people of the family. They pray in most of the homes they visit, and seek to lead people to an immediate decision.

"It is a notable fact that almost without exception such approaches are received most graciously, and the visitors are cordially thanked for coming. But, best of all, in a large majority of cases, immediate and definite evangelistic results are secured.

"Is not this method simply a return to the original type of evangelism? Jesus was that kind of evangelist. The disciples were that kind of evangelists. The early Christians were that kind of evangelists. Through all the years that method of approach has yielded the largest evangelistic results. Even in great organized revival campaigns, where whole commu-

nities have been shaken and hundreds saved, the personal appeal of awakened Christians has produced the largest fruitage."

IT MAY BE A GOOD THING THAT WE DO NOT HAVE ANY MORE leaders than we have, at least in the church. The tendency is to take refuge behind a leader and let him do all the thinking, all the planning, all the directing, while the rank and file do a little work—if it does not take too much effort and they do not have to bear too much responsibility.

But there is a disposition today to bring the man and the woman in the pew to realize their obligations and to share in the duties of the church. This is seen on the spiritual side in the demand for the family altar and for personal evangelism. Writing in *The Expositor upon Household Evangelism*, which is also called "visitation evangelism," Dr. William F. Rothenburger deplores the dependence upon outstanding leaders and makes this strong plea for the evangelistic activity of all church members:

"He who feels the heartbeat of Jesus as he carries His cross toward Golgotha cannot resist sharing his compassion for others. The artist who assumed to portray the significance of this tragic event by placing along the Via Dolorosa a life-size statue of the master staggering under the weight of the tree did not complete the drama. As one looks upon the scene, he involuntarily casts his eyes about for Simon. One expects to see him get under the load *with* Jesus, symbolic of every disciple's duty and privilege. Discipleship is inherently and essentially evangelistic.

"Paul must ever be accounted the outstanding evangelist of the Apostolic era. Through him the Gospel leaped across the boundary lines of little Palestine, into other pioneer fields of conquest."

"It is fortunate, however, that the evangelization of a community or of the world is not wholly dependent upon the great. Lesser lights may also play their part. Very early in the mother church the evangelistic passion inoculated the entire group for 'they therefore that were scattered abroad went about preaching the Word.' Furthermore, this is the type of evangelism by which the gospel was to be spread during the early centuries of the church. 'It is a remarkable fact,' says

Schaff, 'that after the days of the Apostles no names of great missionaries are mentioned till the opening of the middle ages. . . . There were no missionary societies, no missionary institutions, no organized efforts in the ante-Nicene age: and yet, in less than three hundred years from the death of St. John the whole population of the Roman Empire, which then represented the civilized world was nominally Christianized. . . . To understand this astonishing fact we must remember that the foundation was laid strong and deep by the Apostles themselves. The seed scattered by them from Jerusalem to Rome, and fertilized by their blood, sprung up as a bountiful harvest. (Vol. II, p. 19). The spirit of evangelism had permeated the rank and file of the early church. By the year 250 A.D., one-twentieth, or about 50,000 of the population of the city of Rome had professed Christianity. By the beginning of the fourth century, it is estimated that the number of Christians in all parts had grown to 10,000,000.

"American evangelism includes many kinds. It ill becomes any Christian to speak lightly of any type which shakes men out of their spiritual and moral lethargy and makes them citizens of the spiritual commonwealth. But there is one sin of which a large portion of the church has been guilty, namely, it has not carried the gospel into home and business circles with Apostolic pungency. It has rather depended upon the unchurched to come to it. It has relied upon outstanding preachers like Jonathan Edwards and Charles G. Finney of the earlier day or upon the Moodys and Sundays of our own generation. The preacher and the evangelist have held themselves responsible for the ingathering while the average disciple has been a spectator. The church has been schooled to expect the masses to flock into the fold through imported magnetism."

"These facts are not ground for discouragement but for re-adjustment. It is not a time for more alarmists but for more evangelists. People are not less religious than they used to be, neither are all the young people going straight to the bad. Neither is the church headed for the scrap heap as John Spargo prophesied a few years ago. But it is clear that the church must *take* its message *to* the people."

THE RADIO IS NO LONGER A NOVELTY, BUT IT CONTINUES TO BE a wonder. We seem to be in the presence of something border-

ing on the supernatural when we realize that everywhere today, even in the privacy of one's home on a remote farm, the air is filled with voices waiting to be heard, and which, with proper equipment, can be heard.

Who could possibly have dreamed when Lincoln delivered his inaugural address in Washington, that men then living would see the time when an address by a President of the United States could be heard by people everywhere throughout the land, or that a man in New York could turn to a small instrument on his desk and converse easily with another in London? Yet these things are now taken as matters of course.

It was inevitable that the radio would be seized upon as a new and very apt illustration of things spiritual. An instance is offered by an article in *The New Outlook* by Rev. R. Edis Fairbairn, called *The Radio Parable*, of which this is a characteristic section:

"The agnostic usually acknowledges a central governing power in the universe, having affinities with what we call mind; but he cannot believe there is any communication between that Unknown Infinite and our puny human lives. He is in the position of the man who has not yet invested in a radio set, who sees his neighbors' antennæ, and hears them discuss the programmes they have heard, but says, 'I don't believe a word of it. You say that these radio programmes are all about us; but I hear nothing of them. My reason tells me the whole thing is absurd. You are suffering from some subjective and collective delusion.' From the point of view of his own situation, he is quite right. He has no apparatus arranged and tuned. For him radio reception does not exist. He feels that if there be a God interested in man, He ought to make man understand that by an inescapable demonstration. He is shocked that man should have to seek with painful groping for a God in whom he lives and moves and has his being.

"Of course, it is plain that God does not force Himself upon our notice. We may not be able to say just why God seems to hide Himself from man, but we must acknowledge that it appears as though He did. On the other hand the words of Jesus have been abundantly proved true that whoever seeks God finds Him, though he may have to learn through painful failure *how* to seek God. It is also obvious that life is so

arranged as to elicit the desire and inspire the search for God. The marvels of the universe suggest infinite wisdom and purpose; its vastness bespeaks the immensity of God; its tremendous forces tell of His power; the stresses and distresses of man's life make him cry out for an infinite Helper, while the hunger of his spirit impels him to seek an infinite Friend. Is it that God *can* only reveal Himself to the soul become conscious of need? Anyhow this is how God deals with us in the process of life, which is a spiritual education. Just as there can be no radio reception without the stretching of the antenna to invite the flying electric ripples, and the establishing of the apparatus that transmutes them into air vibrations, so there can be no personal discovery of God without the up-flung hands of entreaty, the heart open and responsive, and listening spirit. When these conditions are met, the seeker for God is born into a new range of life, with a different kind of experiences."

GRAVE CHARGES ARE BEING MADE AGAINST THE STUDENT CLASSES respecting their religious views and even their morals. But whatever the truth, any effort to improve conditions might better be directed toward the influences that American ways of thinking and living bring to bear upon the average young man and woman in our colleges and universities.

The mechanistic theory of the universe has a wide vogue in institutions of higher learning, and the natural effect of this view is to weaken or destroy one's sense of responsibility to God. This negation of religion breaks down one's moral resistance until any temptation finds him with little or no defense. This brings us to a second adverse influence the student must meet, but one of a more tangible character.

The Congregationalist has published an interview with Ralph F. Barton, Executive Secretary of the Continuation Committee of the Evanston Student Conference, by Granville Hicks, on what youth is thinking and doing with respect to the church. In responding to the question by Mr. Hicks, "You think, then, that the indifference to the Church is simply part of a general indifference?" Mr. Barton in this answer revealed some of the temptations that beset the student today, especially if he lacks religious resources:

"You're just right. And I think there are two principal reasons for this indifference. First, there's the prosperity of America. Most students have everything they want—comfortable rooms, good-looking clothes, money to spend on dances, football games and theaters. Lots of them have cars. Nobody has to study very much if he has any intelligence, and they go skimming through, having a beautiful time. How can you arouse people like that to any consciousness of the reality and vitality of basic problems? Their whole way of life is a grand conspiracy to help them forget that problems exist.

"In the second place, our educational system tends to suppress every attempt at original thinking. Most of our colleges are big machines for grinding out diplomas. Most of the students come for social prestige and a good time. Most of the teachers are afraid of ideas when they see them. The structure of modern education is against the man or woman who wants to think for himself. If he starts thinking he's likely not to get the required number of credits. If, on the other hand, he will carefully memorize what the professor says in his lectures and in his textbook, he can easily skim by. Today actual thought is a handicap in most colleges. The best we can do is to arouse a minority. And let me say that on nearly every campus there is a thinking minority."

THE RURAL PROBLEM AND THAT OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, NOT to mention others, ought to demand so much attention from our Protestant churches that small time would be devoted to controversy and matters that do not contribute to the Lord's cause. In the case of religious education the trouble is, that both the content and the methods are subjects of disagreement. Much education that is called Christian is merely ethical, and some of it even warrants the charge of being anti-Christian. We must have the truth to give, and we must also have better facilities for giving it. This means that the Sunday School, at least as now conducted, is not enough. Dr. Guy L. Brown voices the need here referred to in this quotation from *The Christian* (London):

"In the next great awakening proper emphasis will be placed on Christian education. As Protestants, we have been woefully remiss in this respect, while the Roman Catholics

have been very active. The result is that Rome, with its teaching based largely upon mediæval tradition, has advanced more rapidly than has Protestantism with truth and soul-liberty as its strong asset. We have, in the main, been too long contented with the so-called Sunday school as our only organized institution for distinctly Christian education, and it has been the miracle of the age that with such imperfect equipment and antiquated methods we have been able to accomplish so much. Had it not been for the aid given by the godly fathers and mothers of the past generation in Christian homes, we evidently would face a more serious situation to-day. The next great awakening in the Church will, I believe, see emphasis placed on weekday Christian education—a certain portion of five days each week during the school year, given to religious instruction under paid directors.

“We must (and we will) in the next ten years give as much money, time and attention to the training of our children in the principles of Christianity as we are now giving for the maintenance of preaching stations.”

TEMPERAMENT IS BLAMED FOR A GOOD DEAL. A PARTICULARLY irritable and impulsive individual—especially an artist, singer or actor—is described as “very temperamental.” Now temperament deserves about all the blame it gets, when it means the natural disposition uncontrolled. But the term applies to more than highly excitable dispositions. There are finely balanced temperaments, strong temperaments, weak temperaments, and negative temperaments.

It has been found that on the mission field—as elsewhere—people break down and fail because of unfavorable temperamental peculiarities which develop to a serious degree under the stress of active work. Dr. Andrew H. Woods of the Peking Union Medical School has made a study of this matter and has drawn up a list of seven temperamental tendencies apt to lead to trouble under the strain of a missionary’s life. But as these are found among people generally, ministers and Christian workers on the home field may profit by this table of unfavorable mental attitudes with Dr. Woods’ comments upon them:

“(1) *Excessive introspectiveness.* Persons who pay much attention to their own feelings and emotions, who think of and describe many symptoms, particularly headaches, dyspepsia, vertigo and backache, are prone to become hypochondriacal or neurasthenic, or, if ‘suggestible,’ they supply the ground work for hysteria.

“(2) *Sensitiveness and ‘touchiness.’* Persons whose feelings are easily hurt, and those who are too much on the alert for encroachments upon ‘their rights,’ who feel neglect and suffer under slights, are not promising material for work in China.

“(3) *The ‘shut in.’* These are sealed, uncommunicative personalities who cannot explain, bring out to the light and so dispel misunderstandings and personal difficulties. This trend is particularly significant, if in addition the tendency to brooding and moroseness is present. These are often persons who tend to write long letters in preference to explaining their positions in conversation; who are argumentative but not persuasive.

“(4) *Egotism, excessive amour propre and self importance.* Bad losers and those who cannot play a subordinate part will impose emotional strains upon fellow workers and will smart under rebuffs and humiliations. Inferiority complexes and faulty compensations are frequent in this type.

“(5) *Bookishness.* The doctrinaire, over-intellectual man, whose thinking is an end in itself, not a means to the accomplishment of purposes. I have seen these persons with such delicately poised judgments that they say pro’s and con’s to every proposition, and could never reach a stable decision. The obsessed, the morbid hesitators and doubters among my patients have belonged to this class.

“(6) *Self-distrust.* Some come to grief because of inadequate apprenticeship before they assumed responsibilities.

“(7) *Defective endurance.* Men and women not schooled from infancy to look upon chores, work, responsibilities, as the normal conditions of life are more apt to grow restive and unhappy under the steady grind of monotonous work. Those who never had to bear hunger, cold, inconvenience, danger and even pain, in camping trips, ‘roughing it’ and in athletic struggles, are less apt to bear up courageously under hardship and opposition in later life.”

WHAT LEADS A NON-CHRISTIAN TO ACCEPT CHRISTIANITY? Is it argument, eagerness to learn the truth, soul loneliness, or some other influence or incentive? How about the results of faith as realized in the lives of believers? Nothing can convince so well as results, and one of the results of sound and real Christian experience and life is the sympathetic heart, which speaks a language that all races understand.

Speaking to the Northfield Conference last year, upon the challenge to the church coming out of the Jewish situation in America, Dr. John Stuart Conning made this significant statement:

"Three-fourths of the Jews in America have that Eastern European background!

"Has not the time come for the Christian church of America to interpret Christianity to the Jew in terms of sympathy and kindness? Yet I am meeting people almost every day, who call themselves by the name of Jesus Christ, the supreme Jew, and who say, 'I don't like the Jews!' That is the greatest barrier in the way of the Jews' evangelization today.

"I sent a questionnaire to 120 Hebrew Christians, picked from a large list that I had, scattered all over the world, because I wanted to get a cross-section of Jewish experience and contact with Christianity. Among other questions I asked this: What was it that led you first to conceive of the possible truth of Christianity? Would you believe it, 98% of those people said that it was the kindness of some individual Christian man or woman! I said that if that is true, then this Jewish problem is not a Jewish problem: it is a Christian problem.

"That is the challenge that comes to you, to interpret Christianity to the Jew. Wherever Christ is interpreted in sympathy and kindness, the Jew is responsive to that appeal."

OUT OF ALL THE DISCUSSION OF CHURCH UNION SEVERAL FACTS are emerging. It is becoming pretty clear, for example, that any union that is worth striving for, that will accomplish what one great, comprehensive, evangelical institution should accomplish, must be of organic rather than organizational genesis. There must be a real fellowship in our Lord Jesus Christ,

rather than one based on an attempt to reconcile all details of doctrine.

It is utterly futile for any one to say that he founds his faith on the Bible, and so will gladly unite with all others of like mind, for, as a matter of fact, he founds his faith on his own interpretation of the Bible, be that interpretation right or wrong. Of course, on the great essential Scriptural revelations intelligent men can hardly disagree. No one in his right mind can deny that the Bible teaches that Christ rose from the dead, though he may refuse to believe it. But men of equal sincerity may very easily differ over the exact importance of certain Christian ordinances.

The Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* asked a number of distinguished leaders to point out some of the barriers to union and the remedies, and their replies directed attention chiefly to want of spirituality, ignorance of the views of others, unwillingness to drop prejudice in nonessentials, and lack of personal capacity for fellowship in Christ, as the great obstacles, as instanced in these quotations:

"So with reference to the drawing together of the Christians who acknowledge the Lordship of Christ, I cannot but believe that the great thing needed is for more Christians, one by one, not only to recognize the obligation for achieving unity but also to accept responsibility, to take initiative, and to put forth unwearying and undiscourageable efforts to achieve their ideal.

"Another hindrance unquestionably has been the lack of intimate fellowship between recognized leaders of various Christian communions. The establishment and maintenance of genuine friendships based on a like fellowship in thought and service invariably helps to generate the atmosphere, the confidence, and the sacrificial devotion so essential to the attaining of the high object in view. Possibly the most fundamental hindrance has been and still is the lack of real prayer for unity. In language concerning which there cannot be any two divergent interpretations, as well as by humbling and inspiring example, Christ has made it clear that the achievement of real Christian unity, and the resultant triumphant apologetic for

the world-wide spread of his Kingdom, is a superhuman undertaking."—Dr. John R. Mott, International Missionary Council.

"The institutional mind. Its temper is primarily psychological and probably inherited; but, with exercise, it unconsciously transforms itself until it assumes the guise of religious obligation. It naturally engrooves itself in conservative forms of thought which, by continuous use, fix an estimate of the value of all church organizations in proportion to their assimilation to its well defined intellectual processes.

"This type of mind refuses to use reason as an instrument of progress, confining its sphere to buttressing belief in already accepted dogmas. With age it becomes more crystallized, and immune to the leadership of the spirit of God, particularly if it impinges upon theological doctrine or church polity, until, in extreme instances, it finds exceeding difficulty in comprehending the possibility of a growth of the spiritual mind."—Dr. S. D. Chown, United Church of Canada.

"The wide-spread ignorance on all sides of the position of those who belong to other churches, and the rather complacent satisfaction of all with their own position."—Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford.

"Prejudices, the result of early training, which prevent many Christians from realizing that forms of worship must vary if they are to meet the varying temperaments of men. Education, fellowship, and prayer are the remedies here."—Dr. Samuel McComb, Episcopal Theological Seminary.

"Loyalty to Christ is the greatest dynamic for Christian service and unity. But loyalty to Christ conceived as the identification of one's own opinions, or those of one's group or coterie, with the will of Christ, is the one great obstacle to unity in Christ. Divergent opinions are no hindrance to fellowship so long as they are recognized as opinions. But opinion disguised as the infallible revelation of Divine truth or the immutable command of the Divine will is the most fruitful source of discord and division. Consequently, the most extreme examples of the sectarian and intolerant spirit has always been furnished by those who believe that they are infallibly right because they have the guidance of either an infallible church or an infallible revelation which is so simple that it does not require interpretation. For all such their very loyalty inhibits tolerance of differences."—Dean Winfred

Ernest Garrison, Disciples Divinity School, University of Chicago.

"The exhortation to Simon Peter is still vital: 'What God hath cleansed that call not thou common or unclean.' Until we cease to magnify the external and look with the eyes of God upon the heart of man we shall still have our unhappy and indefensible divisions."—Dr. Finis S. Idleman, Central Church, Disciples of Christ, New York.

"I have come to the conclusion that the greatest barrier to Christian unity is the denominational spirit. We do not get together because we are more anxious for our own party to succeed than we are for the extension of the Kingdom of God. When enough Christian people really want Christian union many of the obstacles that are in the way will disappear.

"One does not really want Christian union until he is willing that his own communion shall be lost in the Kingdom."—Dr. A. W. Fortune, Central Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky.

IN TIMES OF UNCERTAINTY AND CONFUSION SUGGESTIONS WHICH would ordinarily be ignored are taken up by some minds for serious consideration. The intrusion into Protestantism of much rationalistic preaching and teaching has naturally led many to long for stable conditions and some authority that could adjust differences and suppress disturbances. This has caused a few to wonder whether or not the solution of the whole problem might not come by reunion with the Church of Rome. On this point and on the question of church union generally The Presbyterian says editorially:

"It is surprising to find churchmen who recognize as valuable or practicable the noted 'conversations' between two church leaders, such as the Archbishop of Canterbury and the late Cardinal Mercier of Belgium. There may be some migrations to Rome by Protestants who are weary of the mere negotiations in many Protestant pulpits and who are fascinated by the note of certainty which Rome gives; but the overwhelming majority of Protestants will see with the passing of the years more and stronger reasons for standing outside of Romanism and opposing her attempts at subjugation. To contemplate

such a union is the most perilous of dreams; for, let us all thank God, it is only a dream and one that is wholly beyond the possibility of fulfillment. Not till the names of Hus and Luther and Calvin and Knox and Wesley perish from the records of the church could that hope be entertained by the most ardent devotee of Rome whose sanity is still secure.

"There are, however, prospects before the world in the reunion of all Presbyterians in one vast body, of all Baptists in a great Baptist brotherhood, of all Methodists and of all Lutherans in a nation-wide Methodism and Lutheran union; of Unitarians and Universalists and Modernists in their own fraternity; and other similar unions of religious forces whose convictions naturally relate them to each other."

HOW IS THE "SOURCE" HYPOTHESIS OF THE PENTATEUCH FARING in these days of intense research? Various books and articles still treat this explanation of the origin of the Genesis records as though it were as certain as the multiplication table. There is often such complacent acceptance of the idea as apparently to admit of no thought that the case against the traditional view is not finally won. But it is not won. Rather is such Biblical criticism losing ground, and that rapidly. In a brief article in *The Essentialist* Bishop Du Bose furnishes such concrete evidence of a critical reaction in Germany that we give these sentences, which will supplement very well what he has written directly for these pages:

"Next to Delitzsch, Löhr in the years before the World War, was the chief support of the Wellhausen hypothesis. In a work which I procured him to write, 'The Five Books of Moses,' and which was printed in the 'Aftermath Series,' he took definite stand for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. In a more recent work, printed in Germany, he has laughed the main contention of the older hypothesis out of court. Professor Sellin, of the University of Berlin, the primate of living archeologists, who once leaned toward the radical position, has put himself in the front of conservatism, and is to be the leader of the future in these matters. Within the ten days just past, I have had a letter from him, in which he says: 'You are right in contending that the Genesis stories go beyond Babylon.' That means that the Genesis stories are

not derived from Babylonian myths; but are an ancient tradition, divinely preserved. With that goes the chief cornerstone of higher criticism.

"Wilhelm Möller, of Rackwith am Elbe, according to my judgment, the greatest Bible scholar (in the sense of interpreter) in Europe, once an 'Anhanger' of the Wellhausen School, as he describes himself, has struck blow after blow against the hypothesis. I have just printed, in a series of sections in the *Christian Advocate* (Nashville), a translation of his 'Deuteronomy, A Pentateuchal Fulcrum,' which I hold to be the completest answer to the whole 'source' hypothesis which has been offered during the twentieth century. Dr. Martin Kegel, of Templin; Dr. Sanda, of the University of Prague, and an extended circle throughout the continent, are reading the obsequies of this hypothesis. Edouard Naville, the distinguished Egyptologist, in 'Was the Old Testament Written in Hebrew?' printed within the three years just past, boldly aligns himself with the traditional school, and argues for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch."

UNHAPPY MUST BE A PEOPLE STRUGGLING TOWARD A PLACE among the world's strong nations, while at the same time lacking a great spiritual motive. The chief factor in America's independence and marvelous development has been the unconquerable desire for freedom—religious, moral, intellectual. It must ever be a source of profound satisfaction to the thoughtful Christian citizen, that the Pilgrim Fathers and early colonists who followed them were no mere commercial adventurers, but were actuated and sustained by lofty ideals and hopes.

The unhappy and disturbing plight of China has called for discussion without end. Let a highly intelligent Chinaman explain what his country really needs. Professor Hu Shih, who has been called the leader in China's modern literary movement, said not long since, in an address before the Central Union of Chinese students in London:

"We have never whole-heartedly recognized the merits and spirits of modern civilization or prepared our young men to undertake their great task. Our young men have gone abroad

merely to acquire technical education, not to be trained as statesmen. When the revolution came, we were caught unprepared. Today, men fitted only for drill-masters are governing vast provinces, and petty politicians are entrusted with the helm of State. This is the real tragedy of China.

"What is needed is a completely revolutionized outlook on life, a new recognition of spiritual values and the possibilities of modern civilization. We need a new appreciation of material progress, not as a means of money-making, but as the effective means of emancipating human energy from the pitiful struggles for base subsistence. We need a new conception of government for bringing the greatest well-being to the greatest number, a new conception of science, not to produce smokeless powder or airplanes for destruction, but as the road to truth and the liberator of the human spirit. The laborers are few, but we must prepare ourselves for the leadership of the nation."

ARE YOU A PERSON OF CULTURE? IF YOU ANSWER YES, ONE might be tempted to remind you that your very affirmation disproves itself, since modesty and the grace to count not oneself to have apprehended are themselves elements of the attainment in question. Indeed, it cannot be far wrong to say that one of the distinguishing marks of a truly cultured soul is a sense of the unattained. Great spiritual leaders have always had it, so have true poets and artists.

While, for practical purposes we may speak of the culture of one person in contrast to the crudeness of another, at the same time it is not an easy thing to define. It is rather a state of heart and mind than accumulated knowledge or acquired skill. A truly cultured person stands at the door of his own soul and looks both inward and outward with calm, just, and penetrating vision.

Naturally a thing so fine induces counterfeits, and our magazines overflow with advertisements of short cuts to culture. For a small sum you can be fitted in a brief time to command the admiring attention of the drawing room or the business office. As a result one stumbles on considerable veneered furniture in both places. A condensation in The

leader's Digest of an article appearing in *The Bookman*, under the name of Robert L. Duffus, analyzes this pseudo-culture in these two paragraphs:

"The hankering after culture also showed itself in America in a system of itinerant lecturers, of which the oracular Emerson was one of the finest products. What Emerson had to offer was a highly civilized commodity. The illusion lay in the belief that he could pass it on, complete and unimpaired, in the course of an evening's talk. Others, including the first trickle of the present flood of British author-lecturers, followed hungrily in his footsteps. Then came the Chautauquas. Coincidentally the old fashioned sewing circle was transformed into a study club. They provided one with what stage people call a patter. But no one ever went away from them to kneel, shoeless and in awe, before the Burning Bush."

"The most noteworthy of the early adventures in the culture industry was the exploitation of Dr. Eliot's five foot shelf. The real value of this collection was undeniable, but it was handed out as though it were a patent medicine. We were to massage a little gently into our scalps every night, and after a while even our best friends would have nothing that they shrank from telling us. Besides, we should be too busy telling things to them. Of course the whole notion was hopelessly barbaric. Anyone who thinks that he can become civilized by the reading of a set of books, no matter how thick they are, hasn't the faintest idea as to what civilization is. For Dr. Eliot it was a luminous and lovely way of life. But for thousands who read his five foot shelf it could have been no better than an incantation."

THE HOME CONTINUES TO BE THE OBJECT OF CRITICISM AND advice. Some blame almost everything on the parents; others defend them and hold modern education to account for undoing the home training. Perhaps the truth includes failure in both institutions. But there are many influences at work in our times to render the home less and less a center of spiritual and moral culture. The outside world breaks in to destroy domestic leisure and quiet. People, old and young, go elsewhere for entertainment and even instruction, while religion is left almost entirely to the church.

A Philadelphia preacher places the blame largely on the fathers. What he says in these remarks about Philadelphia is increasingly true of all great cities:

"We are long on honor to wife and mother, short on honor to husband and father. Why! Because so many husbands and fathers are unworthy of it. They allow themselves to sink into the place of mere money-getters. They lose the respect and love of their families because they have become mere machines for the grinding out of dollars and cents. So busy are they that they lose all the instincts of lovers and drop into the rut of mere machines. We hear loud lamentation over the downfall of the American home. Who is to blame? Well, many wives and mothers. Lay it also at the door of negligence of many husbands and fathers who have sacrificed their homes on the altars of money and Godless pleasures. Once Philadelphia was the city of homes; it is rapidly becoming a city of flats where the word 'home' has disappeared. Let the husband be not only the provider, but the priest of his home."

IF OUR AGE IS NOT CONVICTED OF ITS SINS IT WILL NOT BE because it has wholly lacked prophets to tell it the truth about itself. Even the secular press is admitting material that does not hesitate to expose and condemn the debasing side of modern life. The center of it all is, as ever, the worship of sex. As President Bell of Saint Stephen's College has observed in *The Atlantic Monthly*, "We are so naively delighted in having discovered that the Eternal made us male and female that we sometimes seem to be forgetting that He made us anything else."

At the time Dr. Bell's warning was issued from the press Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of Detroit, addressing the National Student Conference at Milwaukee, uttered a denunciation of our present forms of idolatry and proclaimed the cost of belief in God in these impressive sentences:

"We worship power because we are all parasites, most of us living directly on some one else. The masculine soul desires power for itself. The feminine soul desires power for the privileges that it brings. We worship our bodies; we sub-

imate, we feed them; we pillow them in luxury. Human ingenuity is exhausting every resource to provide new physical comforts, edifying the sensual, with every movie theater a shrine and every chance movie actor a symbol.

"If you want to believe in God you will have to divorce yourself from the kind of immoral nationalism which laughs at humanity. If you want to believe in God you must disavow an industrialism and commercialism which puts privilege before personality and substitutes new forms of slavery for old ones. If you want to believe in God it is necessary to overcome the lust of the senses which steep us in every kind of cult—from the cult of the automobile to the cult of Rudolph Valentino."

CONDEMNATION OF DEGRADING THEATRICAL STANDARDS, OF IMPURE books and pictures, is to be expected from religious and moral leaders and from men and women of good taste. It is particularly encouraging, however, to have a noted actress, who has never written more than once or twice for publication, take up her pen to condemn the present fad of filth in drama, art, and literature.

This has been done by Julia Marlowe (Mrs. E. H. Sothern) who not only takes the right side of the question, in the first of three articles in *The Churchman*, under the caption, *What's Wrong with the Theatre?* but also speaks with force. It would be hard to find in as few words a rebuke of uncleanness in these things more logical and severe than this one:

"It is true that public taste is usually low. Most theatre goers and indeed most readers are inclined to select what is trivial. They are unaware of 'the dainties that are bred in a book', or of the delight to be found in the capable rendition of great plays. This condition prevails in America for lack of standards of excellence constantly proclaimed, which should stand like rocks for every man to see amid the ebb and flow of the tide of frivolity and change inevitable in a society fluctuating and incomplete. The revolution of today against the ancient gods, in painting, literature and in the drama, is but a repetition of former periods of rebellion and discontent. The futurists, expressionists, the new schools in poetry, sculpture and painting are reflected in the theatre in the scenery, in the subjects of drama, in the manner of representation.

'The emancipated', 'the advanced', 'the sophisticated' drama we are told, shall supersede outworn methods and more reticent manners. Obscene subject, dialogue, action must be allowed because these exist in life.

"But art is not life; that at least is obvious. A painting, a book, a play, is but a selected instance of life. That beastliness exists is not an excuse for its public exhibition. Art is the expression by man of his desire to escape from the pain, stress and ugliness of life into the Kingdom of Beauty. Those who would drag before him the reproduction of that hideousness which impedes his upward flight and would direct his eyes from the heavens to the mud, reminding him ever of his own unworthiness and deficiencies, do him but a sorry service; show him not so much what he is but what he may become."

FEW IF ANY FORMS OF EVIL APPEAR IN PEOPLE SUDDENLY, fully developed. Some of them are the indirect results of efforts to escape distressing conditions. A boy driven to the streets by cheerless and uncomfortable home conditions may be taking the first step toward a criminal career he has never contemplated. So our present day tension, coupled with rather unnatural everyday physical conditions for many of us, lead thousands to seek forms of recreation and amusement that speedily come to have their unfavorable moral effect.

In an article in *The Independent* Silas Bent expresses the idea that we have gone pagan in our idolizing of the athlete and shows the influence of all this upon religion. As condensed in *The Reader's Digest*, his words are in part:

"What I have in mind is the spontaneous worship of the human body in manifestations of beauty and skill and strength, such as gave rise in Rome and Athens to the Olympics, the bacchanals, and the sports of the amphitheater, until the Emperors Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian took things in hand and substituted Christianity.

"Signs and portents are not lacking that something is happening to Christianity. Religion has a critical fight on its hands. Among many observers of the fact, I need mention only Dr. E. R. Groves, of Boston University. 'Religion has been displaced,' he says; 'a new civilization built on a pleasure basis is an actuality.' I think it may be plausibly argued that

here has been a recrudescence in this century of the old pagan worship of the flesh.

"Our industrial civilization, which makes for sedentary occupation and supplies machines for what might be muscle-building tasks, has heightened our native appreciation of physical achievement and comeliness. We no longer look with Puritanic disfavor upon the body. Young men's and young women's Christian associations maintain gymnasiums and swimming pools. The cultivation of beauty is not rated nowadays as heretical or perilous; even the lipstick may be used in public. We accord unaffected admiration to heroes of the screen, diamond, gridiron, and tennis court. Football games crowd international politics off the first pages of our newspapers, and athletic stars succeed bathing beauties in our picture sections. We burn incense to grace, symmetry, youth, loveliness, heft, and skill. Our religious calendar is a tabulation of sporting events, and our Aphrodite is 'Miss America.'"

PROBABLY NO ACT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN recent years has caused such a flurry of interest in Protestant circles as the annulment of the marriage of the Duke of Marlborough and the former Miss Consuelo Vanderbilt of New York. The special reason for this was not the position of the parties most concerned, but the fact that the Roman Church seemed to step down from its high and rigidly held position respecting the dissolution of the marriage bond. To Protestant minds the explanations offered by Catholic writers have not been convincing. The Presbyterian Advance has put the whole matter in this brief but forceful way:

"The American public will have cordial sympathy with the recent protest of Bishop William T. Manning against the annulment of the marriage of the Duke of Marlborough and the former Consuelo Vanderbilt. He might well characterize it as 'action which seems wholly at variance with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church as to the sacredness of marriage.' It is also quite pertinent for him to ask, 'What right has a Vatican court, sitting in Rome, to pass on the validity of a marriage between the members of another communion, solemnized in a Protestant Episcopal church in New York, under the laws of the United States of America?' and to add:

'Marriage is a civil contract as well as a religious one, and the claim of any foreign court, ecclesiastical or civil, to pass upon the validity of marriages solemnized in this land between persons not in its own communion is an unwarranted intrusion and an impertinence.' Of course, the Vatican could reply that marriage is essentially a religious sacrament and that the church solemnizing this marriage was no church, which would be satisfactory to nobody but the Vatican. If this were true why go through the form of an annulment, basing it upon the claim that the bride of thirty-one years ago was coerced? Why not be straightforward about it and say they were never married? The ugliest charge brought against the Roman Catholic Church in this connection is that of opportunism and it would appear very well founded in view of the facts that the annulment makes it possible for the duke to become a member of the Roman Church and for the subsequent marriage of the one-time duchess to good Catholic Jacques Balsan of Paris to be sanctified. This business is a body blow to the vaunted claims of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of maintaining the sacredness of the marriage relation."

BOLSHEVISM IS NOW NEARLY TEN YEARS OLD, BUT THERE IS STILL much contradiction and lack of certainty in the news which comes out of Russia. Numerous travelers have made their reports, but there has been rather more than a suspicion that their trips about the country were carefully arranged, so that they would see and hear only such things as would make their accounts largely favorable to the present regime. There has also been an exceedingly busy Bolshevik propaganda in America.

Last summer what appears to have been a highly competent, though unofficial, mission went from America to Russia. It consisted of two business men, four educators, five editors and publicists, five social workers, two ministers, one lawyer and one physician, some of the persons included being of national prominence. Professor Jerome Davis of the Divinity School in Yale University, a leading member of the mission, has published an account of its experiences and observations in *The Congregationalist*. He shows that great precaution was taken to avoid being influenced by government officials or

sympathizers. Several of the party understood the Russian language, most of the interpreters chosen were sympathizers with the old order of things, and both friends and foes of the government were interviewed as the members of the mission traveled freely about. All this gives weight to this statement by Professor Davis upon the religious situation:

"Our group agreed on certain outstanding weaknesses in the Russian situation. First, the Bolsheviks might be termed dogmatic atheists.' They do not have an attitude of reverent agnosticism, such as was held by Darwin, but they are actively fighting religion. The famous motto inscribed on the city hall in Moscow, 'Religion Is the Opium of the People,' typifies their conviction. After having been in Russia for a year under the Czar's régime, I can well understand this attitude. It will be remembered that, in spite of the beautiful mysticism of the Russian Church, it was allied with the Czar's government, in fact supported and corrupted by it. Stalin, the present ruler, started his training in a theological seminary. He was excluded for reading the writings of Karl Marx. Many priests acted as informants against revolutionists. It is small wonder that the revolutionary leaders began to feel that religion was merely superstition in alliance with autocracy. They are now trying to substitute for religious faith a philosophy based on science. Unfortunately, they are not content merely to oppose religion, but have gone so far as to prohibit its organized teaching to children. To be sure, the churches are permitted to function, and any religious denomination which had Sunday schools prior to the revolution may continue them now. No denomination, however, can inaugurate a new program of Sunday schools. There is also rigid censorship of all printed material. While these severe restrictions are being applied to religious believers, communistic supporters have free right to propagandize anywhere in favor of atheism. Utter nonsense is being circulated as fact; for instance, it is denied that Christ ever lived, or it is asserted that he actually was a libertine."

THE DISCHARGED PRISONER IS A PROBLEM FOR SOCIETY IN GENERAL and for the church in particular. His old acquaintances among the law-abiding hardly regard his companionship now as of any advantage to themselves, employers are suspicious of him, while at the same time the evil-minded incline to look

upon him as something of a hero, a fellow worth cultivating. If he has completely lost self-respect there is little to appeal to; if he retains any personal pride he may be cynical and resentful of all approaches that recognize him as a man with a criminal record.

It is not hard to see that such a life is the subject for something more than advice or any formal reclamation scheme. A revolutionary change must occur within the man before external opportunities can offer much hope of permanent success. Mr. B. L. Scott, who directs the Bureau of Restoration, in Pennsylvania, in a report to the Social Service Commission of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, drew this picture of the convict's attitude and the duty and opportunity of the Christian ministry, both before and after his release:

"A convict ordinarily enters the prison gates with all sense of respect gone. He has suffered humiliation, loss of friends and loss of public esteem. His mental attitude may be one of hate. Just so long as he is in such a frame of mind no program of restoration can affect him. The prison authorities fully realize this and their aim is to help the prisoner regain his self-respect. This seldom can be accomplished if his friends abandon him. It is the duty of the ministers in any community to keep in touch from the very beginning with all who are sentenced to prison. Very often it is the ministers alone who can reconcile the family. Every effort should be put forth to keep up the interest of the family and intimate friends in the prisoner either by visits to the prison or by correspondence. There is no better way and usually no other way in which the prisoner can regain his self-respect and right mental attitude.

"Moreover, the pastor must anticipate the parole of his prisoner friend. It is an exceedingly difficult matter for a prisoner to return to his community and face his old associates. He realizes that he is a marked man and that there are all too many in any community who will shun him. If ever a man needs a friend it is when he has made an honest attempt to regain his place in society under the stigma of a prison record. Let me urge that you instill in all of your associates the determination to be of real help to the prisoner not only in prison but when he returns to his community."

THERE SEEMS TO BE A DISTINCT LINE OF DEMARCATION BETWEEN criminals who are first offenders and all those who have pursued further their careers as law-breakers. Many a young fellow has been trapped into his first crime by evil associations, a foolish impulse or one of those chance acts often back of youthful waywardness. His future is determined by the effect of his first encounter with the law. It is here that the probationary plan does its fine work. A paragraph that has been going the rounds of the papers emphasizes the difference between the two classes of criminals and strongly supports the probationary system:

"A New York judge recently made a critical study of the probationary system, so popular in the treatment of criminals. From the court records he took at random ninety-seven cases of prisoners who had been put on probation during the past eight years. Eighty-one were first offenders. He found that all of these had lived up to their pledges when released, but not one of the other sixteen who had previous criminal records but returned to his old practices. The judge concludes that probation is good for first offenses, but should never be granted to old criminals."

ONE OF THE PERPETUAL—WE MIGHT SAY CHRONIC—SUBJECTS of debate is capital punishment. This penalty is attacked from the Scriptural standpoint, and it is defended from the Scriptural standpoint. It is attacked as to its effect in checking murders, and it is defended on the same ground.

With respect to its efficacy, the evidence appears to favor capital punishment. Massachusetts has gained the reputation of severity toward criminals, and as a result there has been found a tendency on the part of offenders to avoid that state. Schuyler Patterson published in *Success Magazine* an interview with Governor A. T. Fuller of Massachusetts in which that official remarked that "Convicts know that no fairy-godmother, in the shape of a ward-heeler, is going to come along, wave the wand of influence and set them free from bondage. And criminals know that few offenses are worth the penalties inflicted by law—provided they are inflicted."

The Governor then spoke at some length, and strongly, in favor of capital punishment, and in the course of his remarks, as the interview is quoted in *The Reader's Digest*, he said:

"My thorough belief in capital punishment is based on my knowledge of the criminal. I have it on good authority that about 90 per cent. of our criminal class are users of narcotics. When under the influence of drugs those who commit offenses may be in possession of a certain amount of false bravado. With the passing of the influence of the drug, however, they become themselves again, furtive, slinking, prepared to fight only if cornered and begging for mercy if caught. Only a cold unerring threat at his own life gives the criminal pause.

"I believe capital punishment is the only thing that puts the fear of God into these people. With life imprisonment there is always the possibility of escape, commutation, or pardon, and, in many cases, persistent relatives, friends and associates have succeeded in influencing governors and officials to use their pardoning power to disregard the interests of the community, turning loose men who will only return to evil doing.

"I believe it can be proved that 70 per cent. of crime is committed by criminals out on probation or on parole."

IF ANY LOCALITY IN THE COUNTRY WAS FITTED TO TEST severely the value of the Eighteenth Amendment New York's famous Bowery was such a place. In one of the most densely populated centers on earth, it had everything to degrade and destroy men and women body and soul. It was manned and equipped to resist every agency that might seek to destroy or diminish its evil power. Yet under prohibition even the Bowery has felt a vast improvement. Those who waver in their belief as to the wisdom of seeking to abolish the liquor traffic, in view of the energetic "wet" propaganda, should consider these paragraphs from an article in *The Christian Herald*, by Dr. John R. Henry, pastor of the Bowery Mission:

"The workers of the Bowery Mission have acquired some clear and emphatic convictions upon the merits of the Volstead Act as related to our locality. The Bowery is the broadest thoroughfare on the East Side of New York. For its length it certainly was the wettest street in America. For many years

it was a Mississippi of rum. Its main industries were saloons and lodging houses. Its chief products were drunkards and worthless men."

"One notable and significant result of closing the alluring and brightly illuminated places of darkness, is the falling off of young recruits. In former years the Bowery Mission pews had a large quota of youthful drunkards in their first steps on the way of degradation. Today youth is absent. Those that fill the Mission are the old and the middle-aged; a young man scattered here and there is oftener a product of illness, misfortune, unemployment or drugs. The blind tiger or speak-easy does not gather in the young as did the old-time saloon. What is the future of any industry that fails to enlist new recruits?

"Dr. Reitman, the president of the Hobo College of Chicago, was a recent speaker in our hall. He had been helped by attendance at the Bowery Mission when a youth. He said: 'I can hardly recognize the old Bowery. It has so wonderfully improved. I can hardly recognize you as a Bowery audience. You are so much cleaner, you keep awake, you have more courtesy. The distance toward a better day that the Bowery has traveled since prohibition fills me with astonishment and delight.'

"A typical Sunday morning congregation at the Bowery Mission is a congregation of poor men. Some are battling to overcome evil habits, some are handicapped by sickness, and many are out of employment. It is an audience that is seeking God, that is looking for help where the saints and martyrs looked who did not look in vain. Thank God when these poor men leave the service they will not face the swinging doors, they will not see the gleaming lights, for their one outstanding, unashamed, and insistent enemy has been outlawed by the law of the land. The banishment of booze is making the Bowery decent."

CITIES ARE VERY BOASTFUL OF THEIR BIGNESS, BUT THEIR GROWING populations are propounding questions that tax the resources of every agency of social helpfulness. It is impossible to crowd hundreds of thousands of human beings into an area so small that the streets could not accommodate them all were they to go outdoors at one time, and then to expect that life individually and collectively will not suffer. Naturally the

weak and unfortunate show the effects more than others, and so we have the slums.

The fine efforts of Mr. August Heckscher to relieve these conditions have drawn attention to them anew, and a *Los Angeles* paper makes this comment:

"Where is the most densely populated spot on earth, the square mile on which the greatest number of people dwell? According to a recent investigation, it is in the slum district of New York. The Heckscher Foundation reports that a single square mile of the slums houses—perhaps stables would be more nearly accurate—more than 400,000 people. Side by side, in immediate contact, are the pride and the shame of New York and of America—the financial district and the slums.

"But is it a life that the citizens of New York and of the rest of the country can afford to tolerate? Such social morasses foster a noxious growth. These slums are propagating places for inmates of asylums and penal institutions. The children born there are likely to be feeble in body and mind. Too many of them become public menaces and public charges."

BOOKS

A CENTURY OF EXCAVATION IN PALESTINE ¹

THE author of this volume, who was formerly a director of excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund, has made a contribution of ranking importance to our knowledge of the history and civilization of Palestine. So far as the Biblical record is concerned, we are told that

“What we gain from excavation is illustration, rather than confirmation. We obtain a background, filling in the outlines drawn by the historian. We learn *how to look* at the events which the historian describes for us. We learn not to think of Bethany and its village life as though Bethany were a village in England; we learn not to picture Solomon’s Temple in our minds as though it were a building of the impressive immensity of a French Cathedral.” (P. 267.)

In other words, excavation is giving back to us the Holy Land as it was when the records were written. While it may corroborate the records or even correct the interpretation of given passages, its chief value consists in correcting us. Even though the results of excavation are necessarily imperfect and incomplete we are able nevertheless to reconstruct a truer picture in our own minds of such points upon which we may be enlightened than we could without them. It is natural therefore that the book abounds in details of exceeding interest and of practical suggestiveness to anyone desiring a truer knowledge of the land and people of the Bible.

Strictly speaking, it is within little more than a half-century that any scientific attempt has been made to discover the secrets hidden in the soil of the Holy Land. Previous to the middle of the nineteenth century religious devotion, curiosity seeking, and sordid commercialism seem to have prompted whatever diggings were attempted.

“The available knowledge of what is sometimes uncouthly

¹ A Century of Excavation in Palestine. By R. A. S. Macalister, LL.D., Litt.D., F.S.A., Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin. With 36 illustrations. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1925. Pp. 335.

called 'Palestinology' was scrappy and patchy in the last degree: the man destined to set the science upon a firm basis had not yet come forward" (p. 21).

The first step toward the modern day of archeological investigation was taken in the year 1824, following the interest awakened in Biblical topography by Edward Robinson, a teacher of Hebrew in the Theological Seminary of Andover, Massachusetts. The epoch-making investigations of Robinson, chiefly in surface topography, and a criticism of tradition, stimulated activity in the succeeding years on the part of many others. His work furnishes a *terminus a quo* for the author's sketch of the history of excavations in Palestine. This introductory chapter develops a number of impressions which are especially worthy of note at this point.

First, the widely cosmopolitan interest in excavating Palestine. The names of American, French, British, and German investigators are prominent among those who have had a conspicuous part in the arduous and all too frequently disappointing searches that have succeeded one another. The eyes of Protestant, Catholic, Hebrew, and Mohammedan have been turned with increasing interest to this land of wonders. Out of the activities launched by individuals grew the work of such societies as, the Palestine Excavation Fund, the Deutsche Palästina-Verein, the British School of Archaeology, the American School of Archaeology, the Jewish Exploration Society, *et al.* In a very real sense the representatives of "many peoples" have said, "Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah"—to dig for the secrets hidden there.

Another noteworthy feature of this introductory discussion (which constitutes nearly one-quarter of the book) is what the author has to say about the principles governing the work of excavation. "A true excavator will attack his chosen site with but one intention—to find out what it contains" (p. 32). Many mistakes have been made by definitely deciding beforehand what is to be found. The program set before one excavator was "Find Gath." It would be better, says the author,

to have said, "Excavate Tell es-Safi, and see what it has to tell us, whether you succeed in discovering its ancient name or not" (p. 52).

"Few questions are more irritating, and more unanswerable, than the stock inquiry which any excavator may expect to be asked by any casual tourist who happens to pay him a visit—"What do you expect to find?" An obsession as to what ought to be in a site will blind the excavator as to what actually is there. . . . It is almost a universal experience that an excavation will mock the hopes that are entertained of it, while at the same time it will give the excavator rewards of which he never dreamed, if only he is prepared to receive them." (P. 32 f.)

Would that the average expositor of Scripture might learn to apply in his field of study this wisdom which has been learned at such costly experience by the excavator in his.

From this survey of the investigators and their methods, our attention is now directed to the results they have achieved. These are described as geographical and historical. Chapter II is entitled Excavation and Topography; Chapter III, Excavation and Political History; Chapter IV, Excavation and Cultural History; Chapter V, Excavation and Religious History.

At least three earmarks assist in identifying a Biblical site. The place must conform in a general way to such descriptions as are given in the Biblical narrative. Then, again, the ancient name is sometimes preserved on the lips of the modern inhabitants. This may lead to grave errors, however. William T. Ellis has since pointed out that the traditional site of Kadesh-Barnea was identified with Ain-Kadeis because of similarity of pronunciation, whereas it is now known by more accurate investigation that its real site is Ain-Guderat. A third and more reliable form of evidence is the discovery, on the site, of an inscription containing the name of the city.

A good example of the problems confronting the excavator, which enter vitally into the definiteness of his results, is in the city of Jerusalem itself. The number of times the ancient city

was destroyed and rebuilt, the use of old materials in reconstructing the new, and the present occupation of the old sites make the task of the excavator exceedingly difficult, if not quite impossible. Four major problems are pointed out and considered by the author: (1) The position of the Jebusite city, afterwards called "The City of David"; (2) the nature of the fortifications and extensions under David, Solomon, and succeeding kings; (3) the course of Nehemiah's wall; (4) the sacred sites of the Gospels. The author is most skeptical concerning any solution of this last problem as far as definite results are concerned. He says:

"In the vast majority of cases, both inside and outside the Holy Land, the determination by excavation or otherwise, of the *exact* site where any event took place is a perfectly hopeless task. . . . The four short Gospels give no help in this matter; they were content with a succinct telling of their tale, and they abstained from distracting their readers with geographical or antiquarian disquisitions." (P. 132.)

He mentions such sites as the following of which no reasonable doubt can exist: The Mount of Olives; the Kidron, Tyropoeon and Hinnom Valleys; the Jebusite city; Solomon's Temple; the Pool of Siloam; the line of the southern half of the city as it was in the days of Solomon and at various other times up to the Crusades. "Christ saw the stones that we may see in David's Tower, in the Castle of Antonia, and in the structures of Herod's Temple" (p. 137).

In answer to the question as to why there are practically no inscriptions in Palestine, the answer given is, "There were inscriptions. . . . But these inscriptions have not been allowed to survive." Jealousy, iconoclasm, intrigue, and war are mentioned as chiefly responsible for our poverty in this respect (p. 147). On the other hand, pottery and potsherds which have survived are a veritable mine of information. The gradual improvement in the shape and decoration of vessels tells a story all its own regarding the cultural development of the peoples who formed and used them (p. 239). Of still more significant value are the potsherds which

never fail of their message, on account of the peculiar nature of pottery. It is easily made, of easily procurable materials. Every household in a community was therefore fully supplied with earthen vessels. Though broken its texture is indestructible. The smallest particle of pottery is recognisable for what it is. Broken sherds therefore accumulate in and around every city in huge quantities. Being commercially worthless they are not removed by marauders; they remain where they have fallen, to teach the lesson which they have to convey to the archaeologist who digs them up." (P. 44.)

The story told by the remains of dwellings, implements, weapons, tombs, etc., is exceedingly instructive and comes in for appropriate attention.

Doubtless a goodly number of Professor Macalister's thoughtful readers will wish that he had given more definite reasons for his criticism of the traditional identification of Rachael's tomb as "the most preposterous in all Palestine" (p. 136), and will question his statement (p. 144), that "The procession of the kings of Judah and Israel have passed, and have left no more impression than the shadows projected on a moving-picture screen," in light of the more extended information which we possess. They will perhaps be more willing than he to rest the matter of "the date of the Exodus, and the relations of the immigrant tribes of Israel to Egypt on the one hand, and to Canaan on the other" (p. 156) until more light is thrown on this perplexing problem, or until the excavator and historian are able to co-ordinate their findings on a more acceptable basis. Furthermore, they will hardly be ready to agree that the Israelites were as characteristically and wholly polytheistic throughout their entire pre-exilic history as he asserts them to have been, without further positive substantiation (p. 296 f.). All his readers, however, will welcome most heartily this illuminating, well-written contribution which brings the story of exploration and research in the Land of Promise up to date.

The thirty-six full page illustrations are carefully selected and add abundantly to the author's treatment. A short

Bibliography at the close offers additional references for further study, and an Index of names and places makes consultation of special points of interest easily available.

HOWARD TILLMAN KUIST.

CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS ²

WE confess that when we took up the present volume and read the title, *Christian Fundamentals*, and the subtitle, *A Modern Apology for the Apostles' Creed*, we had a feeling of great comfort and satisfaction, which rather increased when we read in the Preface that the substance of this book was delivered to students of Aberdeen University during the session of 1923-1924, as the Murtle Lectures on Christian Evidences.

A brief perusal of the book, however, very soon caused great disappointment which increased after a deeper scrutiny of the contents, and we came to the conclusion that the title would have better described its contents if it had read *Christian Fundamentals Criticized*, or something like it. In fact the "apologetic study of each article in the Apostles' Creed," as the author is pleased to describe his work, seems to be made rather the means of criticizing the writings of the authors of both the Old and the New Testament, not to speak of Calvin and the Westminster Confession, which he delights to ridicule whenever the chance presents itself. Our Lord Himself, in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, exalted the authority of Moses and the prophets above the evidence of even "one risen from the dead." This is the description which this professor of divinity and Biblical criticism gives of the Old Testament:

"Just as in the Old Testament there is preserved for us the record of a gradual revelation of the nature of God, from a very primitive conception of God as a tribal deity up to the moral and righteous, omnipotent and omniscient Lord worshipped by the later prophets, a conception not far short of

² *Christian Fundamentals: A Modern Apology for the Apostles' Creed*. By Andrew Cumming Baird, B.D., B.Sc., Regius Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, University of Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926. Pp. viii+304.

hat of the loving Heavenly Father whom Christ revealed to man, so with regard to the problems of sin and evil we have in the Old Testament a conspectus of what man has thought on these great themes from the most primitive ideas prevalent at the dawn of Old Testament history right up to the developed doctrines of sin and evil and suffering that we find in the greatest of the prophets" (p. 239 f.).

A little later Dr. Baird gives his own exposition of the meaning of Genesis in the following terms:

"In the Genesis account of the origin of evil in the Garden of Eden (Gen. iii:1-21) we have an example of man's primitive ideas on this subject. Sin is due to an evil deity, the serpent who by subtle wiles seduces mankind from allegiance to the good God whom he has promised to obey. In the prohibition by Jahve against eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, there was no ethical question involved. It was rather a case of obedience or disobedience to the arbitrary command of the present and all-powerful God of the Garden." (P. 240.)

At this point Dr. Baird cannot refrain from showing his contempt for the Calvinistic interpretation in a manner which is characteristic of this book when he says:

"God, 'for his own good pleasure,' to use a Calvinistic phrase, forbade man to eat of the tree. The stage of religious growth here represented would be called by the ethnologist the stage of Totemism, with its system of taboo—certain things must not be touched because God would be offended. But the very fact that the serpent was successful in the Garden in seducing mankind shows that God was not all-powerful. The evil deity, the serpent, could sometimes win in the conflict." (*Ibid.*)

As was to be expected, our author's view and interpretation of these events is felt in all his exposition of the New Testament and of the Creed, and leads him to condemn the interpretation of his own church in particular and of evangelical Christianity at large in many of the fundamental points of our faith. Thus, speaking of the Virgin Birth of Christ he says:

"Surely this is a most extraordinary and Jewish way of

limiting the power of God—to say that God could not become incarnate by way of human birth—that God could not bring into the world a sinless being by ordinary generation because the Book of Genesis says, or is supposed to say, that because of Adam's sin, all men must inevitably bear the taint" (p. 84)

A little above, speaking on the same subject, he thus expressed himself:

"As it is in the Calvinistic theology of the Shorter Catechism: 'The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression.' But surely there is something Manichean in such a conception, for it implies that there is something inherently sinful in the normal and ordinary process of generation." (P. 83.)

A little after this Dr. Baird makes an astonishing statement and one which might make Malthus rejoice in his grave. He reasons as follows:

"If the theology of John Calvin and the Westminster Divines, in this respect were true, then surely it would be the duty, not only for the clergy to remain celibate as the Church of Rome demands, but for every God-fearing citizen to refrain from marriage and from the procreation of children, that the sinfulness of the world might be brought to an end. But surely the Gospel of Christ who taught, 'Suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' negatives everywhere such a dismal pessimism." (P. 85.)

Dr. Baird quickly disposes of the New Testament accounts of Christ's birth, either by explaining away the ordinary meaning attached to them (as in the case of Luke) or by boldly denying their authority and inspiration (as in the case of Matthew). Speaking of Luke's account he says:

"And there need be no difficulty about the universal voice of tradition that Jesus was born of the *Virgin Mary* [italics by the author.] Surely the highest and sublimest meaning to be attached to these words is that given by St. Luke, that the annunciation of the Birth was given to Mary when she was

Virgin. . . . And the perpetuation of the name Virgin Mary is a constant reminder of the greatness of the miracle." (P. 78 f.).

In the case of Matthew Dr. Baird is unable to explain away the force of his narrative through any exegesis, and so he remarks:

"But it may be asked, how then did Matthew's account originate, an account of the Birth of Christ that has caused so much trouble to sincere Christians in the later ages of the Church's history? Historically we do not know. From what tradition or written source he obtained his information is completely unknown. But philosophically we can surmise how his version of the Virgin Birth in its crude and popular form took its origin." (P. 80.)

And after having explained, in the next two pages, its similarities with heathen, Mohammedan, and Buddhist myths he concludes:

"So also the popular mind has sought to reduce the spiritual mystery of the Incarnation to material terms, by narrating the crude story of conception by the Holy Ghost, as it is in St. Matthew's Gospel" (p. 82).

But our author feels equally competent to correct and rectify the statements of any or all of the Old or New Testament writers. For instance he says about the author of the Fourth Gospel which he constantly calls St. John:

"Now it seems to me that such a great purpose was in our Lord's mind, though the author of the Fourth Gospel failed completely to understand it" (p. 284).

But while Dr. Baird is so bold in contradicting the inspired writers whenever it suits his purpose, on the other side he is quite ready to quote the most obscure passages in order to prove some of his tenets. Thus, in commenting about the descent of Christ into "hell," he refers to 1 Peter 3:19 in proof of his assertions and says:

"The Descensus . . . assures us that even death cannot separate us from the love of Christ, and the souls of those who have died ignorant of His saving Gospel may still be

brought into His presence, and instructed by Christ Himself. This article opens up to the mind the glorious possibility of the offer of salvation even *after death* [italics by the author] as 1 Peter iii:19 seems to teach, a doctrine which both the universalism of Christ's teaching and our inherent sense of justice seem to demand." (P. 127 f.)

But our author goes so far in his corrections of the New Testament as to assert that even the "unpardonable sin" will be forgiven. He says:

"A most important point to be decided when dealing with Christ's teachings about sin and its forgiveness is this: Does He teach that some sins merit and receive everlasting punishment? Is the possibility of obtaining repentance and forgiveness ever ruled out? There are statements in the Synoptic Gospels which seem to imply that there were penalties for sin that were eternal, and never could come to an end. . . . But here again the language is that of Jewish apocalyptic which received a totally new meaning from Christ. 'Everlasting punishment' became to all intents and purposes a new conception when used by our Lord. Its meaning seems to be not a penalty laid upon a transgressor by an angry God, but rather the meaning is that the man who had consciously sinned and transgressed shall continue to bear the penalty that that sin brings with it until he repents. And if he delay his repentance till the end of time, then, to the end of time, will the burden of the penalty be his." (P. 256 f.)

"The will of God is that all should repent. He is 'not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance' (2 Pet. iii:9), and His will surely is that even those who have been guilty of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit should also come to repentance and be forgiven." (P. 258.)

But, in our author's view, even repentance is not necessary in order to secure God's forgiveness:

"When He announces to several of those brought to Him for healing, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' He is not proclaiming a new edict of pardon from God for the particular case, but only enunciating the great truth that the loving God is always forgiving, always gracious, always merciful and pardoning. But the faith in Christ of those who came to be healed has opened their hearts, and made them able to repent and turn

from their sins, and to appreciate the forgiveness of God." (P. 259.)

Such being our author's views about sin and its forgiveness, it is not difficult to anticipate what his views may be about Christ's death. He says concerning this event:

"Accepting, then, the Death of Christ as recorded in the Creed as an historical fact, we notice first that in the statement about Christ's death in that symbol, there is no hard and fast theory of the Atonement, no mention of the elaborate hypotheses of later days that the Death of Christ was eternally preordained, part of the inevitable purpose of God. We find no statement in the Apostles' Creed that Christ had to die to satisfy Divine justice, or to placate an offended Deity, or that Christ had to be sacrificed to pay the debt of men's sin." (P. 94.)

"And the reason why the Cross is made so central a point in all doctrines of salvation and redemption is simply this, that when men had committed the enormous crime of crucifying as a criminal the pure and stainless Son of God, and when the awfulness of the results of their disobedience to Him and of their unbelief in Him began to dawn upon their souls, then in their agony they came to see the meaning of the whole Person and Work of Jesus—that He came into the world and became incarnate 'for man's salvation,' as the Nicene Creed has it" (p. 110).

This is beautiful reading, but where do we find in any part of the New Testament that such events as the author imagines and describes really took place? And from all these premises Dr. Baird comes to these conclusions:

"All this implies that the one way to overcome sin is to treat it, as God does, with love and forgiveness. Nor are we to wait for the penitence of those who injure us before we forgive. Our forgiveness must be there all the time, but he who has sinned against us will only be able to understand and appreciate our forgiveness and love when he has repented." (P. 261.)

"And this implies a most revolutionary change in all our ethical standards. It means the abolition of all thoughts of reprisal, retaliation, or vengeance against those who injure us—and the abandonment of all human institutions built up on

the principle of retaliation. . . . we must believe in the abolition of war and strife, and in sweeping changes in our penal system banishing from all punishment the element of retaliation." (P. 262.)

Consistently with these views our author applies them also to the world to come and expresses himself thus:

"And further, as so many philosophers have pointed out, there seems a flaw in Divine justice, if an eternity of punishment without possibility of redemption is to be meted out by God to one whose sinful life did not exceed threescore years and ten" (p. 294).

"It would be a monstrous injustice to think of God separating all humanity on the basis of merit into two great classes—the just who are to inherit everlasting life and the unjust whose lot is to be everlasting punishment" (p. 295).

"The whole motive of punishment is not retributive, but to bring the sinner to repentance" (p. 296).

Finally we notice that the present work is printed on very thick paper, with wide margins and exceedingly large type, so that it constitutes a volume of over three hundred pages, which could have been easily and conveniently reduced to half its present size.

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

RELIGION IN THE MAKING ³

THIS book consists of four lectures delivered by Professor Whitehead of Harvard in King's Chapel, Boston. They comprise the Lowell Lectures for 1926. Those for 1925 were also delivered by Professor Whitehead on the subject, Science and the Modern World. He has followed similar lines of thought in both series, applying the same method in two fields.

The present work is not primarily a study of religion from the historical point of view, as the title might suggest; the approach here is philosophical. The author's aim is best stated in his own words in the Preface:

³ Religion in the Making. Lowell Lectures, 1926. By Alfred North Whitehead, F.R.S., Hon. D.Sc., Hon. LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. 160.

"The aim of the lectures was to give a concise analysis of the various factors in human nature which go to form a religion, to exhibit the inevitable transformation of religion with the transformation of knowledge, and more especially to direct attention to the foundation of religion on our apprehension of those permanent elements by reason of which there is a stable order in the world."

It is further stated at the beginning of the first lecture that it is the purpose of the course "to consider the type of justification which is available for belief in doctrines of religion" (p. 13), a question which confronts every generation of mankind in some form.

The first reaction of the average reader of this book is one of wonder that these chapters were intended to be lectures. The audience capable of listening to them intelligently would be very limited indeed, being confined to those having some philosophical background. The thought is condensed in the extreme; there are many sentences which could be expanded into paragraphs. The technical terms of philosophy are freely used. The value of the book lies, therefore, in its suggestiveness for those who are interested in the problems of metaphysics and in the psychology of religious experience; it is not a popular treatment of the subject.

The title of the first lecture is Religion in History. The goal of development in religion is what is termed "rational" religion. Rational religion is defined as "the wider conscious reaction of men to the universe in which they find themselves" (p. 42). In its external phases religion shows four sides, ritual, emotion, belief, and rationalization. These four sides are the successive manifestations of religion in history, in the order named. When religion emerges in history it is simply ritual, without beliefs or a rational system. When the final phase is reached it becomes a coherent system of beliefs in harmony with other beliefs. (See p. 18 f.) The semi-civilized masses of mankind have halted at the third stage, that of uncriticized belief; a satisfactory ritual and belief have been worked out, and there is no aspiration for higher things.

This highest stage of rationalization is comparatively modern, coming within the period of known history. The Bible is the great illustration of the manner in which rational religion emerges. The definition of religion here used is put in this way:

"Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness. It runs through three stages, if it evolves to its final satisfaction. It is the transition from God the void to God the enemy, and from God the enemy to God the companion. Thus religion is solitariness; and if you are never solitary, you are never religious. . . . Accordingly, what should emerge from religion is individual worth of character." (P. 16 f.).

With this last phase, therefore, comes the age of the martyr. This "solitary" note is now introduced. The individual finds himself in conflict with the community; the prophets of Israel, for example, became the severest critics of the communal religion. The late appearance of this type of religion is due to the fact that it had to wait for a general progress of mankind which would make such a conception of religion intelligible. Rational religion has become possible with the development of a world-consciousness; men have found themselves in a larger universe and have been compelled to adjust their concepts to it. Judged by the standard here set up, Christianity and Buddhism, the two religions which really hold the field in the world today, are both decaying; "they have lost their ancient hold upon the world" (p. 44).

The second lecture is upon Religion and Dogma. The author first discusses the nature of our knowledge of God.

"This question of the ultimate nature of direct religious experience is very fundamental to the religious situation of the modern world" (p. 64).

"But there is a large consensus, on the part of those who have rationalized their outlook, in favor of the concept of a rightness in things" (p. 66).

Direct intuitions constitute the ultimate religious evidence. The point is next made that there is but one dogma in debate today, "What do you mean by 'God'?" The Eastern Asiatic,

the Semitic, and the pantheistic answers are discussed, together with the Christian position. The lecture closes with a section on the Quest of God, with reference to which quest the author says, that "it is impossible to fix the sense of fundamental terms except by reference to some definite metaphysical way of conceiving the most penetrating description of the universe" (p. 78 f.).

This leads to the third lecture, entitled *Body and Spirit*, in which the author gives a metaphysical construction in accordance with his purpose to show what grounds may be offered today for belief in the doctrines of religion. He gives his own construction, which allows for the creative activity of God, and meets certain objections to the doctrine of God. He concludes this lecture with the following:

"The religious insight is the grasp of this truth: That the order of the world, the depth of reality of the world, the value of the world in its whole and in its parts, the beauty of the world, the zest of life, the peace of life, and the mastery of evil are all bound together—not accidentally, but by reason of this truth: that the universe exhibits a creativity with infinite freedom, and a realm of forms with infinite possibilities; but that this creativity and these forms are together impotent to achieve actuality apart from the completed ideal harmony, which is God" (p. 119 f.).

The final lecture is *Truth and Criticism*. The main point here may be stated thus: Dogmas are necessary, but they are never to be regarded as final. They must, therefore, be continually readjusted according to the demands of advancing knowledge. "Religions commit suicide when they find their inspirations in their dogmas" (p. 144). The reason that Christianity and Buddhism are decaying, as noted before, is that they have each assumed an attitude of self-sufficiency, neither being willing to learn from the other, while both have barred the door on science, the third competitor in this realm of truth.

The concluding section of this lecture gives the author's own views as to the nature of God. Every entity is limited; God's limitation is His own goodness.

"He is complete in the sense that His vision determines every possibility of value. . . . God is the one systematic, complete fact, which is the antecedent ground conditioning every creative act. . . . He is the mirror which discloses to every creature its own greatness. . . . God in the world is the perpetual vision of the road which leads to the deeper realities." (Pp. 153-158.)

It is not necessary for our present purpose to enter into a discussion of the validity of Professor Whitehead's philosophical conceptions. Two or three points may be made here.

In the first place, there is no mention of any such thing as revelation in the entire discussion; in fact, such an idea might be regarded by many students as foreign to the matter in hand. To the evangelical believer, however, the point of view which omits entirely the work of the Holy Spirit and God's revelation of Himself from such a study as this is a point of view of secondary importance, to say the least.

The second point is, that the Bible fares but poorly here. Professor Whitehead has this to say about it:

"It exhibits the note of progressive solitariness in the religious idea: first, types of thought generally prevalent; then protesting prophets, isolated figures of denunciation and exhortation stirring the Jewish nation; then one man, with twelve disciples, who met with almost complete national rejection; then the adaptation for popular survival of this latter doctrine by another man, who, very significantly, had no first-hand contact with the original teaching. In his hands something was added and something was lost; but fortunately the Gospels also survive." (P. 30.)

Third, it would be difficult for the evangelical believer to adjust himself to the complete ignoring of Christ in the discussion of this line of thought. To be sure, the aim is to consider the factors in man which have been at work in the making of religion, and again it may be said that this is doubtless a legitimate line of approach, but of secondary interest to many students of the problem who find in Him in whom all things consist a satisfying solution of many of the world's most perplexing questions.

We are bound to acknowledge our debt to every thinker who helps to clarify our vision in the field of religious truth. Professor Whitehead's book stimulates thought and helps to confirm some of our conclusions. We continue, however, to feel that it will be hard to surpass a book that begins where Professor Whitehead ends, by affirming, "In the beginning God created."

PAUL F. BARACKMAN.

THE ROOTS OF RELIGION IN THE HUMAN SOUL ⁴

THIS book consists of a series of lectures delivered last July before the Midsummer Conference for Ministers and Religious Workers at Union Theological Seminary, New York. We devote to it a more extended review than its intrinsic merits warrant because it presents one of the popular attempts to ground religion in some part of the human soul where it will forever remain beyond the reach of modern science and thought. The author uses for his purpose a blend of the philosophy of Kant and Fichte together with the theology of Ritschl.

The value-judgment theory of religion has two schools in the Modernistic field of practical religious thinking, the reproducible experience school of which Dr. Fosdick is the best known present day champion, and the reproducible ethics school of which the Unitarians once were the outstanding champions, but which today has a very considerable following in many branches of the church. The former appeals to the mystical temperament; the latter to the non-mystical, practical temperament. We do not mean to imply that these two schools are conscious rivals; in practice their adherents move back and forth from one standpoint to the other without any conscious knowledge of their changing positions, and are allied comrades in a common cause. Only when they are pressed for an intellectual foundation for their faith do they separate and rally around their respective theories.

⁴ The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul. By John Baillie, Professor of Christian Theology, Auburn Theological Seminary. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926. Pp. xii+255. Index.

For some time the reproducible experience school has been enjoying unusual popular favor. But its historical, philosophical, and psychological weaknesses are at last beginning to seep through into the minds of the people to such an extent that the reproducible ethics school is now coming to the front with reinforcements to help hold the Modernistic position. This revolving cycle of emphasis is running true to historic form, so that we have every reason to believe that the next position which the Modernists will occupy will be this one. For this reason a careful study of its strength and weaknesses as presented by this very frank and enthusiastic champion will not come amiss.

The frame in which the author sets his discussion is the religion of the soldiers in the late World War. With this he begins and ends his study. The first chapter is entitled *The Present Situation in Religion*. From the traditional highways of investigation, the reader is transported to the battle-fields of the war, and there introduced to the soldiers and their religion. This method is chosen because, without extensive survey, it serves "to bring into clear relief . . . the main features of the situation that is at present confronting the Church." These non-professional, civilian soldiers "in reality . . . were little less than the whole active manhood of our several nations dressed in military clothes." So that, ready at hand, we have here a segregated cross section of the active manhood of the nations. When their religion is examined the startling fact is revealed, that only about twenty per cent. of these soldiers have any real, vital, interest in religion or the church. For eighty per cent. of them institutional religion falls outside the range of their interest.

Yet, the author points out, these same soldiers had a positive standard of conduct, a positive philosophy of life, and a positive faith to guide them through the terrible ordeals that faced them. In proof of this assertion he quotes freely from the various books which give reports on the religion of the soldiers. A sample quotation, taken from the British report on *The Army and Religion*, is the following:

“It is impossible not to feel the sharpness of the contrast when we turn from the comparative poverty of the religious thoughts and ideals of the men to the wealth of noble virtues which they reveal in their relationship to one another and to the splendour of heroism which in great multitudes they have shown in loyalty to duty and to Fatherland” (p. 23 f.).

Bringing this statement into the concrete, the author says:

“If we ask what particular virtues were best loved and most nobly displayed by the men, we have this impressive list given us. . . . courage, unselfishness, generosity, persistent cheerfulness, straightforwardness, humility, loyalty, devotion.” (P. 24.)

Commenting upon these virtues, the author remarks:

“Similar lists are to be found in all the books, and what strikes us at once, as it so forcibly struck the observers themselves, is the amazing Christianity of them. They read like Pauline lists of the fruits of the Spirit!” (P. 24 f.)

These virtues were supplemented by a philosophy of life and a faith no less remarkable. A sample of this is given in the following quotation from a letter of a soldier who says:

“We realise at the Front . . . that the issues of life and death aren’t in our hands. . . . But just because we do the only right thing and realise that everything else is out of our power, there comes to us a peace of mind and content. We take the *one step* and trust the rest. . . . It is the beginning of the peace of God.” (P. 30 f.)

These aspects of the soldiers’ natural religion the author thus summarizes:

“This faith, then, the men of our armies had and by it they lived. But—and here lies the final tragedy of the evidence—it did not occur to them to think that this might be what that puzzling thing, religion—or Christianity—was after all about.” (P. 31.)

At this point the reader is taken back from the battlefields to the theological seminary class room, and the author proceeds to establish his theory that the natural religion of the soldiers is proof of the fact that the roots of religion are

embedded in the natural virtues of the human soul, and these virtues spring from the categorical imperative of "duty" which is the absolute and ultimate possession of every human being, from the functioning of which religion develops.

After devoting a chapter to the criticism of Rationalism and Romanticism, which are characterized as misunderstandings of religion, the author takes up the question, *What Religion Really Is*. His view is thus stated:

" . . . religion is, in the inmost heart of it, an affair neither of cosmological hypotheses nor of unfamiliar psychical experiences, but rather an affair of conduct, of how one lives one's daily life and faces one's daily task and trial" (p. 91).

In giving his definition of religion, the author says:

"Shall we say that *religion is a consciousness which comes to the dutiful, to the loyal, to those who are true to the highest values they know, that in being thus dutiful and loyal to their values, they are doing what they were meant and appointed to do, and are putting themselves in line with the Eternal and have His backing behind them?*" (P. 112 f.)

The abundant satisfaction of the writer with this definition of religion is well expressed in this passage:

"How good it is to see the truth of religion grounded at last neither upon cosmological, teleological, and ontological demonstrations on the one hand, nor upon esoteric mystical visions on the other, but upon 'the sentiments of a well-behaved soul!'" (P. 124 f.)

To clear up the position of the author beyond all cavil, we have this statement:

"The view of religion to which we have thus been led may now be summed up very briefly. Religion is, essentially, a product of our consciousness of value: it is an outlook on things which arises, characteristically, in the doing of one's duty." (P. 119.)

There is no mistaking the theory here presented. Religion is a "product" which "arises . . . in the doing of one's duty." It is a product, not a producer. It is a result, not a cause. The rise and development of religious consciousness

and experience is dependent upon doing one's duty. How then does religion arise out of duty done? The last chapter in the book bears the title, *How Faith Arises in the Soul*. In the opening paragraphs the author presses straight to the heart of his problem. All those who are not loyal to the call of duty are beyond the reach of religion. They never can know God. So he says:

" . . . we must begin by putting to the inquirers this very basic counter-question: Have you a firm grip upon your values themselves? For that, after all, is the first vital point. . . . There is no use at all (as, indeed, preachers have in every age known) in attempting to bring home the evidence of religious truth to a man whose hold upon goodness and love and honour is in any wise loose. . . . How can a man who refuses to look Duty in the face ever hope to find God?" (P. 206 ff.)

A positive statement of this idea is found in this passage:

"I am prepared to lay it down that there is nothing in life of which we are more certain than we are of the broad outline of our duty. The certainty which attaches to our primary moral values is the greatest degree of certainty which it is given to the race of man to possess." (P. 209.)

The author seems comfortably assured that the certainty which attaches to our primary moral values is the broadest and most secure foundation upon which religion can rest. To this feeling he gives expression in this passage:

"Surely we have here a firm standing-ground on which it is ever possible for us to fall back. Surely in love and loyalty, in righteousness and honour, in chivalry and unselfishness, we have an unshifting platform on which all good men may meet, doubters of every degree, believers of every communion." (P. 214.)

Having struck rock-bottom foundation, the author now begins to build upon this the superstructure of his theory of religion:

"Now I have been at so great pains to emphasise the security of our common values and the absolute nature of our primary moral certainties, just because I am so sure that it is

out of these values and certainties that faith in God alone arises in the soul" (p. 214 f.).

This idea is developed into this assertion:

"It is never possible for a man to have a firmer hold upon God than he has upon duty. . . . The only assurance of God which religion ever promises is an assurance which is of the same kind, of the same texture, as our assurance of our ultimate values." (P. 215.)

It is important to follow these assertions step by step as we progress. The only assurance of God which religion promises is here set down as of the same texture as our assurance of our ultimate values. How, then, are we to separate the two? The answer is, that at the beginning they cannot be separated. As the author puts this problem, "How can faith in God thus be a natural accompaniment of loyalty to our values?" And then he says:

"The answer is that faith in God naturally accompanies such loyalty because it is a thing that is itself very closely akin to it. Indeed we may say that to believe in duty and to believe in God are not, for the man of faith, two different beliefs, but only one belief. To believe in God is, at least in its beginnings, hardly more than a deeper way of believing in duty." (P. 221.)

The distinction between duty and God which makes the difference between religion and ethics arises in the performance of duty. It comes about in this fashion:

"What happens is simply that to the seeker, in the course of his loyal striving to do the right and eschew the wrong, and to do 'the utmost for the highest,' there comes—sometimes with the light of a sudden revelation, but more often slowly and gradually—the realization of a new and deeper meaning than there is in duty and goodness" (p. 221 f.)

This "deeper meaning" grows until it takes on the character of religion. The process is thus described:

"He has been believing all along that goodness and love and honour are the things that matter most in all the world and he has been seeking these things with a single-hearted

devotedness. But now there grows up in his mind something like a conviction that these things are the very pillars on which the world is built." (P. 222.)

The second step is here given:

"All along he has been believing that there is laid upon him an absolute obligation to do what is right and to follow the narrow and difficult way of duty and of selfless service. But now he comes to feel in a clear and explicit way, that it is nothing less than the hidden nature of things that is laying this obligation upon him." (P. 222 f.)

The next step in the argument is:

"For how can he be obliged to do the right if, in the last resort, the Universe does not care whether he do the right or the wrong? 'I *must* seek the highest,' he says, and there is nothing of which he is more sure; but whence can that *must* derive, if not from the nature of things?" (P. 223.)

We are now ready for the last step in our philosophy of religion. The distance between our present position and the landing place being so great, a jump will be necessary. So we will go back and take a good running start. The author warns us that we have only "one little hint" to guide us, and he talks about "best clues." However, we prefer our figure of the jump. Here is his runway:

"It is, then, on this knowledge, and on these intimations of a trans-human reality given to us in our knowledge of good and evil, that religion builds. Does it seem a slender foundation? . . . Ah, but one little hint may have vast implications and lead to endless vistas of discernment! It was one little hint that came to Archimedes, to Newton, and to Einstein. And if the one little hint be this—that our values are grounded in reality, and that our highest values are consequently our best clues to the nature of reality—then how far can we not go from that beginning?" (P. 237 f.)

Well, let us see how far we can jump from this "one little hint" as a springboard. The author does so, and lands safely, and this is what he finds:

"The Universe cannot demand righteousness and love of me, unless Itself be righteous and loving; but how can anything

be righteous and loving except a living Person? . . . If duty mean anything, if conscience be not a lying voice, then at the heart of the Universe there is Life and Mind and Reason, because Goodness and Truth and Love." (P. 238.)

If the reader has been a sufficiently good athlete to follow the writer, he has arrived with him at the goal. The pursuit has been filled with adventure, and has had thrills and rewards of its own. But this is quite characteristic of all extreme Modernism. Let us now return to our sober thinking.

In all seriousness we confess that, if these lectures had been a series of practical sermons, they are so sincere and morally stimulating that we would have been disposed to commend them without pointing out their psychological defects. But, when they represent a scholarly attempt to give to religious specialists the psychological basis for the origin of religion, and claim for the theory here presented that it is the way "faith in God alone arises in the soul," we are compelled to warn one against building too confidently upon this foundation. For it is seriously undermined by all modern scholarship.

Take his fundamental assumption, that "the certainty which attaches to our primary moral values is the greatest degree of certainty which is given to the race of man to possess." So long as moral conviction remained traditionally stabilized this theory of religion had some foundation, but in an age in which "Our Dissolving Ethics" is one of the most disturbing questions with which society is confronted it is the uncertainty of all primary moral values which has become the problem.

Again, according to the social theory of religion, the one who follows the behest of duty does not come "to feel in a clear and explicit way, that it is nothing less than the hidden nature of things that is laying this obligation upon him," but that it is society.

Again, the position, that belief in duty and belief in God are not two different beliefs, but "only one belief," is the direct contradiction of all the findings in the field of psychology of

religion. In other words, modern ethics, sociology, and psychology are all opposed to the theory of religion here advanced. The rise of duty, conscience, values, religion, God, are all explained upon other grounds. And the author has given out one trace of evidence throughout the whole course of lectures that he is aware of the fact that he is living and thinking in a very different world from that in which Kant, Fichte, and Ritschl lived and thought. The single instance in which the author betrays any knowledge of the problems which modern ethics, sociology, and psychology have created in this realm is to be found where the argument for the absoluteness of the moral imperative is grounded in the "nature of things." Confronting this question: "How can the Ultimate Reality demand righteousness in me, if Itself be not righteous?" he allows a momentary doubt to steal into his pages in this form:

"Perhaps some modern moralist will say that it is not the Ultimate Reality that demands righteousness in me, but only human society; and that the enclosing System, in which my ultimate values are grounded and from which my moral obligation derives, is not the 'scheme of things entire,' but only the human species" (p. 234 f.).

But this suggestion seems to the author to be too absurd to deserve respectful consideration. So he dismisses it with the remark, "I hope none of you will object to my characterising this as sheer nonsense." Then he continues:

"If it were true, it would mean that society itself was under no obligations and was conscious of no duty to do, or to require of its members, one thing rather than another. It would mean that whatever society as a whole chose to do or to demand was *ipso facto* right and good, its standards being entirely self-determined." (P. 235.)

This idea he dismisses as casually as he did the other, with this remark, "But you and I know better than to believe these things." Now it may be that a group of ministers and religious workers will agree with the author, that these modern ideas are "sheer nonsense." And it may be flattering to them to be told, "you and I know better than to believe these things."

But were he doing his regular teaching under shadow of great universities in which his students were daily taking courses under some of the leading psychologists and sociologists of the country and were being taught these very theories, he would be forced to deal with them more concretely. Fortunately psychology and social psychology are both advanced to such a mastery of their subjects that they no longer leave religion at the mercy of this pre-social science theory.

It is not necessary at this time to take up the ethical and sociological aspects of the problem, but we will turn to the psychological. The theory presented by the author makes religion the product of ethics; it is in the doing of one's duty that religious consciousness and experience arise. Religion is grounded in the categorical imperative. Its life is dependent upon consciousness of moral values and response to the moral imperative of duty. This commits it to the care of the will and runs into voluntarism. And this is a psychological theory of religion which perished with Professor William James. The one outstanding fact upon which modern psychologists are agreed is, that religion occupies a place all its own in human life. Professor Rudolf Otto, in his book, *The Idea of the Holy*, expresses this fact in these words:

"Religion is not in vassalage either to morality or teleology, '*ethos*' or '*telos*', and does not draw its life from postulates; and its non-rational content has, no less than its rational, its own independent roots in the hidden depths of the spirit itself" (p. 140).

A very fine recent development of this point of view will be found in the Kerr Lectures delivered by Dr. Kenneth Edward under the title, *Religious Experience: Its Nature and Truth*. However popular the reproducible ethics theory of religion may be in the minds of those who are seeking for a firm foundation for religious faith that is beyond the reach of science, it can never hope to survive the attacks of modern ethics, psychology, and sociology. The theory of religion which grants to it autonomy in its own realm, however, is the only one that

has a chance of holding its own, and winning independent recognition for religion side by side with all the other experiences of which human nature boasts.

Final proof of the fallacious character of the author's theory of religion is presented by his unfortunate featuring of the religion of the soldiers of the World War. According to the evidence submitted by him these soldiers, in their virtues, philosophy of life, and faith, possessed potentially the germs out of which religion is supposed to grow, when one is loyal to the call of duty. And these soldiers fulfilled this demand in a very unusual way. So that this combination should have made them the outstanding religious group in modern society. But for some reason they have not experienced religion in any remarkable degree and seem to have failed to follow through the inevitable steps of the theory so carefully outlined.

The reviewer was with the Rainbow Division on the five battle fronts of France during the major engagements, and he finds these reports to be highly idealized interpretations made by a few of the very religious among the twenty per cent. who were interested. In *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*, for April, 1919, he has an article entitled *The Pup Tent and the Pulpit*, in which he gives his observations of the religious interest of the soldiers in France and then places side by side with it a survey of the religion of their parents who stayed at home. This comparison leaves the situation in its balanced form. In practical experience on such a large scale as was furnished by the soldiers and the World War this theory of religion has entirely failed to function. No great revival of religion has followed the return of the soldiers from the fields of battle to their homes.

Religion may, but religion does not necessarily, arise in the performance of duty; or ethical culture societies would become the true incubators of religion. Religion is not in vassalage to morality. For, historically, morality owes more to religion than religion owes to morality. And religion is

genetically functioning long before moral values are crystallized into categorical imperatives.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

ESSAYS CATHOLIC AND CRITICAL ⁵

IT is too far back for readers of this Review to remember the sensation caused by the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, in 1860, but it is not too far for many of them to recall the lesser sensation of *Lux Mundi*, in 1890, when a bevy of High Anglicans made a pronouncement on topics of theology and Biblical criticism similar to that under review. The striking point was the cordial attitude to Old Testament criticism, though there really was nothing strange in this, as the doctrines of Christianity are unaffected by anything which can be proved in the literary and historical history of the Old Testament.

The present volume presents fifteen able essays by competent members of the High Church school: *Emergence of Religion*, by James; *Vindication of Religion*, by A. E. Taylor; *Authority as a Ground of Belief*, by Rawlinson; *Authority of the Church*, by W. L. Knox; *Christian Conception of God*, by Thornton; *The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Hoskyns; *The Incarnation*, by J. K. Mozley; *Sin and the Fall*, by Bicknell; *Grace and Freedom*, by Mozley; *The Atonement*, by Kirk; *The Resurrection of Christ*, by Selwyn; *The Spirit and the Church in History*, by Milner-White; *The Reformation*, by A. H. Thompson; *Origins of the Sacraments*, by N. P. Williams; *The Eucharist*, by Spens.

It must be remembered that our High brethren hold many things of infinite preciousness in Christianity, and their expositions and defenses can be read with profit outside the stimulus from communion with scholarly and earnest minds. Cut out the "Catholic" element of these thoughtful essays,

⁵ *Essays Catholic and Critical*. By Members of the Anglican Communion. Edited by Edward Gordon Selwyn. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. Pp. x+452.

and the larger part remains as a permanent contribution to Christianity which intelligent ministers and laymen can well concern themselves with. Highly recommending, then, this Christian part (though it must be confessed that too much of it is written with that aloofness and cultured reserve with which Anglican literature has made us familiar), let us look at some of the so-called Catholic points.

It is urged (p. 99) against the Protestant view of the Bible as authority that that meant the "Bible as interpreted by the system of some particular Reformer, who claimed that this particular system was the only true interpretation of Scripture," so that the result was "warring bodies anathematizing each other" and agreeing only against Rome. There is much exaggeration here. The "Catholic" Church itself has to interpret Scripture in order to know what it says. But the body of the Reformers, Lutheran and Reformed, were agreed as to the main things, even signed creeds of agreement, and did not anathematize all others.

The writer agrees, however, that the "Christian body as a whole needs a standard of faith and life which it can accept as adequate as a means of salvation" (p. 100). While individuals differ, of course, on points of Scripture, and there remains a cleft between the Roman and Protestant churches on doctrine, it is true that all earnest seekers who use the historical, critical, exegetical method of Bible study find the Scripture not only "absolutely adequate as a means of salvation," but as giving one voice on all important Christian truth. And those who without scientific training read Scripture find substantially the same result and reach the same truth. The drawing up of confessions of faith by Protestants "was really an admission of the inadequacy of the Bible, since these confessions, while claiming to be the only true interpretation of Scripture, are found to widely differ in important matters of doctrine." This is also an exaggeration. The Reformation creeds are wonderfully harmonious, and their drawing up was not at all an admission of the inadequacy of the Bible, but was for historical or prudential reasons alone.

"The claims that the Scriptures alone are sufficient guides could only be maintained if all impartial inquirers arrived at the same conclusions." But all impartial inquirers did and do arrive at substantially the same conclusions. Set one hundred competent and fairminded men chosen at random before the New Testament text and they will reach the same conclusion as to (1) the unity and character of God, (2) the Deity of Christ, (3) the influence of the Holy Spirit, (4) justification by faith, (5) salvation by trust in Christ, (6) the necessity of a holy life, (7) an eternity of rewards and punishments, etc.

The author is at fault in saying that the Fourth Gospel has "transformed its materials in such a way that it is almost impossible to disengage the tradition from the interpretation" (p. 162). There is a minimum of "interpretation" in John, perhaps none in the ordinary sense, but only a reproduction of the deeper sayings and greater deeds of Christ. What the author could have truly said is this, that John's Gospel *selects* (not transforms) its materials in such a way that the "interpretation" of Jesus current among His disciples in His own lifetime and up to the time of the composition of the Gospel was—over against Gnostics and unbelieving Jews—the true one.

"There is no more sacerdotal writing in existence than the very first chapter of Acts" (p. 329). If so, the definition of sacerdotal in the author's mind must be an esoteric and most remarkable one. "The Catholic Church of early days is its [Protestantism's] acknowledged inspiration" (p. 340). While all ages and sections of the church aid and inspire one another, not the Catholic Church, but the Word of God, was and is the inspiration of Protestantism. The author compares the "Protestant bodies [*sic*] to the Church [*sic*] which is the formal sacrament of the Holy Spirit to mankind." But how is the Church of England a sacrament of the Spirit to mankind in any sense in which, say, the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland is not? And is not every true Christian church, not simply the "Catholic," "sacramental [in a sense] of the gift of

the Spirit, instituted by God, trustee of the birth, death, resurrection and eternal love of Jesus the Lord" (p. 341)? Dear old Herbert is quoted with approval as contrasting the "perfect lineaments" of the Church of England to the "allurements of the wanton" of the Seven Hills on the one hand and the "dishevelled array of the wayward inhabitants of the valley" (Protestant churches) on the other (p. 345).

At the Reformation the "choice lay between the abandonment of outward unity for a sectarianism guided by individual caprice and the maintenance of the compact of ecclesiastical order" (p. 37). This was never an alternative at that time. There was not a party, perhaps not even a man, against the papacy "guided by individual caprice." The Church of England—"has found her way to an abiding place in the Catholic community from which she has never separated herself by any action or declaration" (p. 366), whereas Article XIX of the Thirty-nine really "separates" her from the "Catholic community" in the High Church sense, that is, from the church where episcopacy is an essential element.

It is a misrepresentation of the Protestant view of the sacraments to speak of the presence of Christ in the sacrament as the result of the "collective imagination of the worshipping community keyed to a given pitch of exaltation" (p. 369), as that view holds that sacraments are ordained by Christ as wonderfully adapted to awaken and strengthen faith, hope, and love, and to bring Christ near to the believer who through them feeds on Him. It is also a misrepresentation to say that Protestants hold that people who prefer other means of access to God than sacraments are still entitled to be called "good Christians" (p. 370), since Protestants should be judged, not by a few extremists, but by their confessional utterances.

It is unfair to strike Protestants with the false alternative that sacraments are either "generally necessary means of objective grace or optional pieces of declaratory symbolism" (p. 373). No Protestant church holds sacraments as such optional pieces. Judge a church by its historic creeds. It is

also a false alternative that, if Christ really instituted sacraments, then they are the "very highest and most central" things in Christianity, the indispensable "vehicles of supernatural grace." Christ certainly "instituted" faith as necessary to salvation. Are there two "highest and central" things? Could He not have made faith central, love greatest, hope the most consolatory, holiness all important, and yet have made sacraments as surpassingly precious in their place and time? Don't narrow Christianity within the horns of your little dilemmas. The author reckons four sacraments, including confirmation and penance (p. 375); but as these two lack both institution by Christ and prescribed matter and form they are not sacraments at all. We do not know that Titus 3:5 refers to baptism (p. 377). But we do know almost as certainly as we know anything that John 6 does not refer to the Lord's Supper. See Westcott's or almost any scientific commentary.

Our Lord's discourses in John are a "unique blend" (p. 379), where we cannot tell which is Jesus and which is evangelist. How do you know? These almost miraculous words would be naturally written down early in John's life as apostle for his own use and that of his societies, and one of his chief concerns would be to report them correctly, and especially to distinguish between them and his own or other glosses. It is not "generally agreed" (p. 379) that the Logia alone sprang from the Apostle Matthew, nor that his "dependence" upon Mark proves that he could not have written his Gospel. Some believe that more than the Logia came from Matthew, and that it was perfectly possible for him to use Peter's (Mark's) vivid and earlier accounts and yet have been an eyewitness himself. The evidence that Christ really said what is in Matthew 28:19-20 is much stronger than the author represents (p. 381). (See also this reviewer's *Crises in the Early Church*, 1912, pp. 11-14). "The words, This do in remembrance of me, may be due to unconscious aetiological invention" (p. 382), that is, desire to attribute a cause for a custom. But would they not rather take the custom for granted without

stopping to invent a false cause? Besides, is not Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians too early for such an invention, representing a tradition too original and pure? Of course, Christ as Lord is in the New Testament, but not the "sacraments in substantially their Catholic shape" (p. 395).

The author thinks that Matthew 16:28 misunderstands Jesus, and turns His words into a prediction of the end of the world and *parousia* as over against Mark's correct report (p. 405, note 1). But the author misrepresents Matthew, for Matthew 16:27 refers to the Lord coming with His angels in the glory of His Father to judgment, while verse 28 refers only to the Son of Man "coming in his kingdom." The meaning of that coming and Kingdom is not further explained. Nor is Mark any different, but the same. (See Mark 8:38, coming in the glory of the Father, and 9:1, kingdom of God coming with power—two different kinds of coming.) Nor do we know that that "coming with power" refers to Pentecost. It may refer to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish church-state, as presage of both the establishment of His Kingdom and the end of the world.

There is a highly imaginary paraphrase of our Lord's possible meaning in Mark 14:25, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine till," etc., (p. 406). But the "Catholic" Lord's Supper is not a "messianic banquet" at all, but a ceremonial shadow of a ceremonial meal where often there are no participants but the officiating minister. We do not know what precisely Christ means in Mark 14:25, probably a general hint of new thoughts, meanings, etc., in the Messianic meals after His death and especially after His ascension.

It is a mistake to say (p. 407) that Christ "prescribes the Trinitarian formula" in Matthew 28:19, and that therefore the narrative is not historic, but a "compendious symbolic" story. For Christ "prescribes" nothing here, much less a "formula," but tells the disciples to "baptize in the name of the Father," etc., which means that whatever the name used in baptism, Jesus or a fuller name, they are baptized really with reference to the full Deity.

It is said that John's baptism was for the remission of sins, and that he and his disciples believed that this was "really effected by the act" (p. 409), whereas the emphatic word here is not "baptism," which the Jews took for granted, but "baptism of repentance," and the repentance would of course insure immediate remission of sins. Nor do we know that those who received John's baptism "believed that they were invested with an invisible spiritual 'character,'" nor how far John's words about the fan and the fire were figurative and how far they related to the "terrors of the end" (p. 409). It is also going beyond our knowledge to say that Christian baptism was always accompanied by laying on of hands and always gave the Spirit—it certainly did not give the Spirit to Simon Magus. (See p. 410.) The author much overstates the regenerating effect of the mere rite of baptism (p. 411). The psychological and spiritual significance of baptism to a new convert as a tremendous cleft between his old life and the new, and thus a challenge to faith, would necessarily bring the Holy Spirit's special blessing, without any semi-magical effect of the baptism itself.

The remark of Polycarp in A.D. 155, "eighty and six years have I served Christ," does not at all mean that "at least one instance of infant baptism took place before the Fall of Jerusalem in 70" (p. 411). How could he "serve" Christ in infancy? It probably means that he had been a conscious Christian disciple for that number of years, or it may be only a general expression of service from childhood. Nor is there any reference to baptism in 2 Corinthians 5:17 (p. 412, note 2), nor in Romans 8:15 to Father in the Lord's Prayer, but only to the Christian's feeling of intimate sonship. Whether "washed" (better "washed yourselves") in 1 Corinthians 6:11 refers to baptism we are not sure; it may be figurative. And if you study the text and context of 1 Corinthians 10:1-4 you will see that Paul has no direct reference whatever to our sacrament of baptism, but compares Israelites going through the sea to a dedication to Moses, and so in a figurative or tropical sense

to a kind of baptism (see p. 414). It is gratuitous to say that at Jesus' baptism the "illapse of the Spirit mediated to him the full realization of his divine Sonship, and therewith some unimaginable consciousness of new birth" (p. 417). All we know is that at His baptism He received *testimony* to His Sonship, and it is absurd to speak of that testimony as producing "new birth" in Jesus. The "full realization" of His Sonship He may have had already, and probably did have for years. The coming of the Spirit in the form of a dove does not mean that He did not have the Spirit before.

Again we have to remark that the overwhelming importance of sacraments inferred on page 420 by no means follows. Christ might have instituted a rite or service, and yet that rite or sacrament might be of much less importance than things which He directly or indirectly declared of vast importance, such as obedience, love, faith. And if those rites are of importance, that importance may not be due as the author thinks to their *ex opere operato* (virtually automatic) efficacy, but to setting forth and sealing truths and graces infinitely more valuable than the rites considered in themselves.

The author indorses the argument of Bishop Gore for the automatic sacramental mediation of grace through material means (say water in baptism, wine in the Supper, etc.) by the analogy of birth, a human personality coming into being by a material process, no more wonderful than sacraments in the "Catholic" view (p. 421). But the birth of a child is a purely natural process, that is, mediated by natural laws entirely. How can spiritual grace come except through spiritual receptiveness or faith (to which of course outward means may help)?

This High sacramental principle is "less liable to abuse" than Protestant dependence on the talents of the minister, on the sermon, etc. But no one believes that spiritual good comes to the worshiper through the eloquence of the minister, but only through the religious responsiveness of that worshiper to the Spirit working through the whole service. It is ungracious

to say that the objection to "Catholic" sacramentalism is a "prejudice which rests on fear of the papacy, hatred of strangers which makes beliefs foreign to one's own repulsive, dualistic modes of thought which sunder God from matter, hereditary influence, and social suggestion" (p. 422). There are millions of Christians who believe that Christ instituted sacraments, that they are obligatory and a blessed means of grace, and yet who do not share this High "vehicle"-*ex-opere-operato*-external media-automatically-mediating-grace theory of those sacraments. And for the most of those who do not believe that Christ instituted sacraments at all and who do not therefore "celebrate" them, there is probably not one who bases his conviction on any of the reasons alleged for the Protestant "*praejudicium*." Finally, the frequent argument for the "Catholic" view from its alleged harmony with God's "Immanence in the whole world of created being and of his unique self-expression in the Incarnation" (p. 422) falls to the ground when we remember that God's immanence in the world is not at all like His "Presence" in a piece of bread, in which He is not "Present" till after the minister's prayer or invocation; and that His self-expression in the Incarnation was a normal and progressive process started by the miraculous birth, dissimilar in kind and degree from any "self expression" in water or in bread and wine induced by priestly act or words.

There is not only no evidence that Paul "regarded the eucharist as a sacrifice" (except of course as a sacrifice of praise, prayer, gifts, etc.), but there is ample evidence to the contrary. "This do in remembrance [not sacrifice] of me." "Ye proclaim [not sacrifice] the Lord's death till he come." "Ye eat" (not sacrifice) the bread. Nor is there any evidence that "devout ritual participation in this sacrifice secured and conditioned participation in spiritual blessings" (p. 431). For Paul such blessings were conditioned only by spiritual attitudes like faith, prayer, etc., which to be sure could be helped by eucharists and other services.

As for the famous discourse in John 6, it has no reference to the Supper, (1) "Flesh" is never used in the New Testament when that Supper is spoken of, but always "body." (2) The verbs are in the present tense, whereas the Supper was not yet instituted. (3) It was an immediate feeding on Christ by faith for which all Christ's disciples were then competent, not simply heeding His teaching but feeding spiritually on Himself. (4) Reference to the Supper in John 6 would destroy entirely the harmony of His teaching. Nor was the evangelist in reporting this discourse "endeavoring to account for a current tradition of Dominical [Christ's] teaching in this sense which he could not ignore" (p. 432), for by the time the Fourth Gospel was written (say 85-90) the Lord's Supper "went" everywhere as instituted by Christ, which was in fact one chief reason why John did not mention it at all. Nor would a stranger "present at the Eucharist naturally described it as a sacrificial rite." For (1) no priest was present, (2) no animal was there for sacrifice, nor knife nor sacrificial appurtenances, and (3) no sacrificial liturgy (which came in the third and fourth centuries). If any thought of sacrifice came to the stranger it would be the only sacrifice in Christianity, viz., praise, prayer, gifts, service, etc.

The depreciation of the *Didache*, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (first published in Europe and America in 1884), though common with High brethren, is unhistorical, as few books were more esteemed in the early church. The author thinks he has "made it possible to describe the Eucharist as a sacrifice in a primary sense without involving or suggesting any repetition of the cross" (p. 433), whereas it is impossible in the nature of things to make the Supper a sacrifice (unless of praise, prayer, etc.) except it be a repetition of that on the cross. Even a so-called "memorial" sacrifice is a contradiction in terms. And it is absurd to speak of a "ritual act" being an element in sacrifice. Nor do the "ritual acts" make the purpose in the slaying of the king's son (p. 435), but the intention in the slaying. By "thinking of sacrifice in terms of

sacerdotal acts, which expressly invest an act of destruction with its significance, then Christ is offered in every Mass" (p. 438). But no sacerdotal acts were prescribed by Christ or the apostles as to the Lord's Supper, and a thousand such "acts" would not make that a sacrifice which was and is not in itself a sacrifice. The author overlooks that his very text disproves him (p. 439), as the word is "show forth the Lord's death" not sacrifice the Lord, not sacrifice the Lord's body (or flesh), not sacrifice the Lord's death.

Arguments on page 443 are in a vacuum. Everybody perceives that bread and wine are not actually changed in the Supper (only their reference) and that you cannot "experience" Christ's body and blood. All that the devoutest Catholic can experience are spiritual blessings as a result of his faith, etc., helped by devout use of the Lord's Supper. The logical result of the author's ideas (p. 445) is his avowed adoration of eucharistic "body and blood," and the Reservation of the Sacrament as still retaining Christ's divinity to be carried to the sick and infirm, and to one instructed in the New Testament this adoration or Reservation is not only crass and superstitious but is also idolatrous.

Finally, sacramentalism did not "find a more adequate basis" in the Incarnation (p. 447), as Christ's incarnate life did not work in any way similarly to the alleged working of the Catholic eucharist, but only by giving Him opportunity to help and bless men by the aid of their rational powers and spiritual attitudes, not by an *ex opere operato* method of His words, deeds, etc. And (over against the esteemed author) all participants in the Eucharist, even those of "lowest" beliefs as well as Quakers, who only spiritually commune, have the "actuality and fruits" of the "believers' union with God," and sometimes even the "conscious feeling" of it, which feeling the author well says is not to be "emphasized in Catholic teaching and practice" (p. 447).

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.